

REVIEW

OF

ELLWOOD FISHER'S LECTURE

On the North and the South.

by J. C. Young

The patriots and statesmen of our revolution entertained but one sentiment and expressed but one judgment on the subject of slavery. Those fathers of their country, Washington, Henry, Jefferson, Jay, Franklin, and others have all recorded their views upon it; with fullness and clearness. They regarded it as a curse to the country, and desired its removal. But, while with great unanimity they condemned the system as an evil to society in all its effects, political, social, economical, and moral, they, with equal unanimity, refused to condemn the conduct of slaveholders as necessarily and in all cases involving wrong. These views, in which the great body of the American people have concurred with the sages of the republic, have been recently assailed with violence from two opposite quarters. The sect of Abolitionists have, of late years, sprung up, who have maintained the doctrine that human beings can never, under any circumstances, be held in servitude without wrong, and have denounced all slaveholders as guilty of gross and outrageous crime—while, as if by a law in the moral world similar to that which we witness in the material, when we see the presence of one species of electricity producing an antagonistic and repulsive electrical condition in some of the surrounding bodies, there have appeared, simultaneously with the Abolitionists, a sect of zealots for slavery, who deny that it is in any way productive of evil, and claim for it the merit of being an institution preeminently conducive to the moral and physical welfare of any community which is so fortunate as to be blessed with its presence. Mr. Calhoun is the leader of this sect—his admirers and followers include perhaps nearly all its disciples. They assert that slavery is not the opponent of free institutions, but that it is a conservative ingredient necessary to be mingled with them to secure their success and perpetuity. One set of men, as they believe, must be slaves, that others may be free. The laboring class they regard as incapable of self-government and unfit to be trusted—they must therefore be enslaved. This class they consider as

the natural enemies of property; they must therefore be themselves converted into chattels to prevent them from mischief. They teach that the past and present history of the world shows that there is a constant strife going on between labor and capital—that it is this which is now convulsing Europe, and that this same struggle will soon convulse our own country, unless some means can be devised for reconciling these jarring interests. They propose to terminate this conflict, not by the adoption of such measures as may diffuse intelligence, respectability, and property among the laboring class, so that the capitalists and the laborers may to some extent be blended in the same person, but by the extension, as far as practicable, of that system by which the capitalist is made to own the laborer. To this school of politicians and philosophers belongs Mr. Ellwood Fisher, whose pamphlet in glorification of slavery we propose in a few successive articles to review. He does not discuss the fundamental doctrines of his party—the incapacity of the laborer for self-government, the antagonism of capital and labor, and the consequent danger of leaving the working men free. This philosophy of slavery Mr. F. did not present in his lecture delivered before the Mercantile Library Association of Cincinnati—its discussion is better suited to a Charleston than a Cincinnati audience, and it can be handled with more fullness and freedom by a South Carolina than an Ohio politician. Mr. F. confines himself to the more humble yet not less difficult and important task of showing that the practical workings of slavery are more desirable than those of freedom—that a system of slave labor is superior to a system of free labor in all its economical, social, intellectual, and moral effects.

It is not uncommon to see ingenious men endeavor to distinguish themselves by assailing some demonstrable truth, or by attempting to prove some palpable absurdity. Spincza wrote a work, exhibiting great metaphysical ability, to prove that there is no God; Hume published some acute dissertations to show that the belief of a miracle is an impossibility; that there is no such

object in existence as the mind of man, and that the material world is a delusion, a chimera destitute of any reality; while Mandeville challenged the attention of mankind to what he conceived or asserted to be a demonstration of the fact that the vices of individuals are benefits to society. The recollection of these works occurred in reading this lecture of Mr. Fisher, in which he undertakes, by accumulating a mass of figures and assertions, to prove that perpetual slavery is a blessing to mankind, and that it is the only condition in which society can reach its highest possible advancement in wealth, refinement, comfort, intelligence, morality, and religion. Mr. Fisher gives unquestionable proof of a singular sort of ability. He possesses, in an eminent degree, the power of blending into one creed the most contradictory tenets, and of comprehending in one mind the most antagonistic feelings. A Quaker—he is an enthusiastic admirer of the institution of slavery; a democrat—he laughs to scorn all the rights of man; and declares the human race to be incapable of attaining its best state, except when one portion of it can hold another portion in bondage; an educated man—he decries the value of schools; a gentleman of philosophical habits of observation and thought—he sees in the magnificent buildings that adorn our cities only the CAUSES OF POVERTY, while the sight of worn out fields, exhausted by slave cultivation and abandoned as worthless, only fills him with admiring conceptions of THE THRIFT OF THEIR FORMER OWNER. He seems to be capable of saying what he pleases and proving what he says. All propositions are alike demonstrable by his peculiar logic—whether he undertakes, as before the last presidential canvass, to prove that John C. Calhoun was the only man who could possibly be elected to the Presidency, or, as now, to prove to the inhabitants of lower Virginia that they are mistaken in conceiving their region to be undergoing a process of impoverishment, depopulation, and decay, and that what they have imagined to be FATAL SIGNS OF ADVANCING RUIN are only the UNERRING SYMPTOMS OF INCREASING PROSPERITY.

There is a kind of logical heroism in the unflinching boldness with which Mr. Fisher moves from position to position, taking up successively each element that enters as an ingredient into national prosperity, and showing of each how slavery has developed it, and how it must develop it, to a higher degree than freedom, until he has completed his demonstration that, compared with slavery, freedom is "evil, only evil, and that continually." The intellectual hardihood requisite to enable a man to march up to such conclusions and encamp upon them as positions which he is willing to occupy, and from which he defies all attempts to dislodge him, is truly admirable. Men of less nerve would have shrunk back from such conclusions—they would have felt some distrust as to the correctness of the facts or the soundness of the reasoning which led to conclusions so revolting to the better feelings of our nature, so hostile to the spirit of our republican institutions, so opposite to the received opinions of the wise and good, so degrading to the nature of man, and so repugnant to those

broad and glorious democratic principles which it is the boast of our country that she was the first distinctly and fully to enunciate, and which it is her pride to conceive that, by her teachings and example, she is fast disseminating among the nations of the earth.

The demonstration, as he terms it, of Mr. Fisher is a sweeping one—it is not a demonstration merely that the slavery of the black race is preferable to their freedom—every principle which he endeavors to establish, as far as it has any force to prove anything, proves as conclusively that slavery, IRRESPECTIVE OF COLOR, is a blessing, and that every nation needs, for its prosperity, that a portion of its population should be kept in bondage.

There are some plain and common sense views which would cause the rejection of this doctrine by the large mass of men, even where they had not skill enough in logic to detect the sophistry of Mr. F.'s arguments, nor knowledge enough to discover the inaccuracy of his statements of fact. If this doctrine of Mr. F. is correct, all the principles on which our republican institutions rest are false—that "all men have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," is not only not a universal and "self-evident truth," as is asserted in our Declaration of Independence, but it is NOT EVEN A PARTIAL truth; it is in ALL SENSES AND IN ALL RESPECTS A LIE. We and our fathers have been practising the grossest cheat upon our own understandings while we have been persuading ourselves to believe it; and we shall be guilty of imposture if we attempt any longer to propagate this doctrine as a truth beneficial to mankind. If Mr. Fisher's views are true, this doctrine is not MERELY A FALSEHOOD, but a falsehood which, as far as it is believed and acted on, tends to prevent mankind from enjoying that state of society which is most favorable to happiness and virtue. As far as Europe has progressed in abolishing serfdom, and giving to all classes equal rights, it has been deteriorating society, by destroying an institution necessary to the advancement of civilization. It would be a strange sight to see tears of sorrow trickling down the cheeks of a democratic American philanthropist, on his reading an announcement that the Russian nobles had adopted measures for the gradual emancipation of their serfs. Yet if the doctrine advocated by Mr. F. is true, that slavery is essential to the best interests of every community, every reflecting philanthropist might reasonably weep on learning that the Russian nobles had determined to substitute wages for the whip; his heart might reasonably sicken at the anticipation of the evils which would follow the subversion of the venerable system of Russian bondage; and he might reasonably shudder as he contemplated the intellectual darkness, the pauperism, the irreligion, and the crime which must settle down on Russian society in consequence of bringing her millions of bondsmen into a state of freedom and changing them from chattels into men.

But we forbear to present even a sketch of the multiplied arguments and facts which prove uncontestedly that the productiveness of the labor of slaves stimulated by none of the motives which

impel men to the cultivation of the industry, economy, skill, and foresight that make the energies of the laborer yield the largest result, must be inferior to the productiveness of the labor of freemen working for themselves and their families, and that freedom is not a privilege designed by our Creator to be enjoyed only by a favored few, but is a blessing capable of being enjoyed by the whole race of man. There is such intrinsic weakness in the arguments of Mr. Fisher that they need no formidable battalion of troops to be wheeled up for their destruction. A mere examination of the principles and facts alleged by Mr. F. is all that is needed for their refutation.

With a coolness that is really edifying, Mr. F. claims the merit of having rescued "this controversy between the two sections from the control of bold assertion and slipshod declamation, and confided it to the umpirage of argument and document." He has certainly the merit of being the first advocate of the superior blessings of slave labor, who has attempted the logic of statistics, and his success in its use, will not, we think, recommend it to the favor of his friends. Such assumptions, conjectures, and irrelevant or half-stated facts as he dignifies with the name of statistical argument, it has seldom been our lot to examine. The advocates of free labor have, however, always appealed to facts authenticated by documentary evidence to verify their arguments upon the comparative merits of the two systems. We are glad to find that Mr. F. has ventured beyond the bold assertion and slipshod declamation of his South Carolina coadjutors touching the necessity of protecting capital against labor, and the beauties of the patriarchal system as exhibited on a plantation of slaves, and has taken his position on ground where his fallacies may be refuted by figures.

The object of the first part of Mr. F.'s lecture is to show that the South is richer than the North. He admits that the reverse of this is "universally believed to be the truth"—but flatters himself that he can convince all men that they have been mistaken on this point. He undertakes to prove that the South in general and "Virginia in particular, instead of being poor, and in need of the pity of the much poorer population of the North, is perhaps the richest community in the world." The proof which he adduces to overthrow this established and universal opinion, founded on the every day observations of men, owes all its speciousness to the assumption of a false criterion of the wealth of a country. The Virginians who witness the decay and impoverishment of their ancient Commonwealth are to be juggled into the belief that it is the most flourishing country on the earth by so paltry and palpable a sophism as that of quietly and without argument assuming an absurd rule for estimating the wealth of nations. The rule by the application of which Mr. F. establishes, to his own satisfaction, his wonderful discovery is, that the comparative wealth of two countries is to be measured by a comparison of the average amount which would be yielded to each individual of their respective communities if the whole property of each community were divided

out equally among all its free members. He proceeds coolly to apply this principle as if every one must assent to its correctness. Now we will undertake to show that a more fanciful and fallacious rule for judging of national wealth could scarcely be imagined. Grant us this principle of Mr. F., and we can, by the use of it, make more astounding discoveries than those by which he has delighted the admirers of slavery. By this principle he has brought old Virginia out of her economical eclipse, and showed her desolations to be radiant with prosperity—but we will bring before the surprised gaze of mankind a luminary in the economical world, hitherto obscured and unobserved, whose surpassing prosperity, as disclosed by the aid of this principle, will dim the glories of Mr. Fisher's admired Virginia. The unexampled wealth of Russia, as she existed some 60 years ago and in her days of barbarism, has escaped the notice of all writers, yet she then towered far above the height to which Virginia has now risen. Here is my proof, given according to Mr. F.'s principle. Coxe, in his travels (Pinkerton's collection, p. 862,) gives us a table of the population of the Russian empire in A. D. 1785. Exclusive of the Crimea and Siberia, the empire contained a total population of 26,084,360—of these the nobility amounted to 200,000, the clergy 120,000, merchant class 250,000, peasants 25,514,360. The peasants were all slaves—the rest free. Now the average price of slaves in Kentucky seems to be estimated at nearly \$300, but we estimate a Russian white slave at less than one third the price of one of our blacks. The value of the whole slave property would be \$2,551,436,000. It will be a very low estimate of all the real and personal property of the empire to rate it as equal to the value of the slaves—so that the aggregate wealth of the empire was at least \$5,102,872,000. This amount divided among the 570,000 free would give an average of \$8,952. The Virginia average cannot be raised above \$758, even with all the aid of estimates that rate the whole property of the State one-third above its real value. "Virginia," says Mr. F., "is perhaps the richest community in the world." What a blessed condition, then, must Russia have been in 60 years ago, when it was more than ELEVEN TIMES AS RICH AS VIRGINIA! But alas! for the transiency of riches and glory! Russia is not now what she was, for her class of freemen has greatly increased, while her class of slaves has comparatively declined, so that now her average is not probably more than three or four times the average of Virginia. She has been rapidly advancing in civilization, in manufactures, commerce, improvements of every description, in population, and in aggregate wealth, during these last 60 years. Mankind have thought that during this period she was rising in prosperity, but mankind can now learn, from the application of Mr. F.'s principle, that, in the case of Russia as well as Virginia, they have been mistaken! They can now see that the progress of Russia toward apparent wealth is a progress toward real poverty, as certainly as Mr. Fisher has taught them that the progress of Virginia toward apparent impoverishment is a progress

toward real wealth. Russia is, however, undoubtedly still in advance of Virginia, but as the free population of lower Virginia is diminishing and the free population of Russia is increasing, we may hope that, at no distant day, Virginia will take precedence of Russia and outrank her in the scale of national prosperity.

Another striking economical discovery we have made by the aid of Mr. F.'s criterion of national wealth, viz: that the plains of Italy were never so full of wealth, nor in so prosperous a condition, as they were in during the period that immediately preceded the overthrow of the decayed and ruined empire by the northern barbarians. The whole campagna of Rome was owned by a few nobles. Nobody inhabited the region but slaves and their overseers. The average property of each of the owners must have been immense; and compared with theirs the Virginia average is despicable. The silly writers of that day mourned over the condition of their country—they deplored the displacement of the hundreds of thousands of free laborers who had once owned, in small farms, those wide plains, beautifying and fertilizing them by their industry and drawing from them an ample support for the dense population of Italy—they bewailed bitterly the sterility and desolation brought upon those once prolific fields by the substitution of hordes of slaves, whose wasteful cultivation impoverished the soil, and made the diminished population of the country depend for subsistence on importations of foreign grain. Had these writers enjoyed the light which Mr. F. has thrown upon economical science, they might have spared their patriotic tears, and smiled on the ruined campagna as he rejoices over the desolations of old Virginia—they might have delighted themselves with the thought that depopulated and impoverished lands were only indications of a higher average of wealth.

The old Greek statesman, who boasted that, though he could not play the fiddle, he could make a small State a large one, was not benevolent enough to impart the secret of his power, if he had one. But mankind are now compensated for whatever loss his selfish concealment of his knowledge may have occasioned; for this invaluable principle of Mr. F. enables us at once to perceive an intelligible and easy process whereby a community may speedily rise to the highest degree of prosperity. That any plan, which will increase the average wealth of its citizens, will, just in proportion to that increase, raise the prosperity of a community to a higher point, is a necessary corollary to the important truth, that the prosperity of a community is to be measured by the average wealth of its members. Now here is a simple and practicable plan, by the adoption of which any State may soon become rich. Let its citizens wear out their lands and move off, selling their worthless possessions for a mere trifle, and leave a few proprietors of slaves the owners of the deserted country. To illustrate the working of this plan, let us see how one of our prosperous counties could, by its adoption, in a few years, augment its wealth.—There is Boyle county in Kentucky, with at present a white population of 4,892, a body of rich land containing 110,000 acres, and an amount of wealth in real and personal estate estimated on the assessor's books at \$1,148,483. Let the citizens impoverish their lands until they reduce them from their present average of \$17.09 to an average of 50 cents per acre. Let them all then remove except ten white families, averaging each five members, and each family owning fifteen slaves. Let these ten families purchase up the whole lands of the county, then worth only \$35,000. Estimating the slaves at their ordinary valuation of \$300 apiece, each white inhabitant of the county would thus possess an average of wealth in land and slaves equal to \$2,000—while now the average of each is a little over \$800. Thus this process would more than double the wealth of the county. It is true that the aggregate wealth would be reduced from \$4,148,483 to \$1,000,000, less than one fortieth of its former amount; but as our principle shows us that wealth is not to be measured, in such cases, by the aggregate but by the average, it is clear that the community has now more than doubled its wealth.

By this principle, indeed, it can be demonstrated that a State, by a single act of legislation, might, in a day, increase vastly its property. If Ohio, for example, were to pass a law making as many of her white laborers slaves as would give her a number of slaves equal, in proportion to her population, to the number in Kentucky,

she would rise at once above Kentucky in wealth, and if she would enslave enough to equal the population in Virginia she would even surpass that Commonwealth the richest in the world, according to Mr. Fisher's judgment. Five hundred thousand Ohioans enslaved, averaging \$300 per head, would amount to \$150,000,000, which added to her assessed property, would raise her aggregate to \$571,067,000. This sum divided among her remaining population, according to the census of 1840, would raise the average wealth of Ohio from \$276 to \$560. Thus Ohio, by a simple act of legislation, might double, treble, or quadruple her wealth, according to the number of inhabitants she would transfer from the class of freemen to that of chattels, from the class of distributees to the class of distributeds. Every freeman converted into a slave adds to the wealth of a country, according to Mr. Fisher, by a double operation—his value is added to the sum total of the property and swells its amount, while his withdrawal from the class of freemen diminishes the number among whom the property is to be divided, and thus increases this mysterious average which is the true index of prosperity.

Philosophers, speculating on the advancement of modern civilization, as Mr. Fisher professes to have been doing, have discovered many curious facts, not the least remarkable of which is this one discovered by Mr. F., that WHILE A MAN OWNS HIMSELF HE IS WORTH NOTHING IN AN ESTIMATE OF THE WEALTH OF A STATE; BUT AS SOON AS ANOTHER OWNS HIM HE BECOMES WORTH MUCH—WHILE A FREEMAN HE IS OF NO VALUE, BUT HE ACQUIRES A VALUE AS SOON AS HE BECOMES A SLAVE!

We do not hesitate to admit that slaves are property in slave States, and that, in estimating the wealth of individuals as compared with each other, their value is to be counted; but, in comparing the wealth of nations or communities, to estimate its numerous class of free laborers as valueless in the one community, and to count in the other its smaller and more worthless class of laborers as constituting a large item in its wealth, would be as wise as it would be, in a comparison of the wealth of two towns, to challenge the superiority for one because water was scarce enough in it to be sold, while in the other it was so abundant as to command no price.

When a principle has been demonstrated to be false by what logicians term the reductio ad absurdum, or an exhibition of the absurdity of its necessary consequences, it is needless, for any purpose of refutation, to notice it any further. We may, therefore, dismiss Mr. F.'s average principle to the place whence it originated—the land of dreams. But as many minds feel an interest in examining why a rule is false that looks plausible and bears at the first view an aspect of correctness, we delay a moment to show the cause of it in the present instance.—When we have occasion to compare together quantities by means of large and unfamiliar numbers, the mind often fails to grasp them so readily and fully as clearly to understand the exact proportion which they bear to each other—or facilitating our conception of this relation, we reduce them to smaller and more familiar numbers bearing to each other the same proportion; thus by a fiction making the small numbers represent what are represented correctly only by the larger ones. This is the principle which we act on always when we use an average rule of comparison, as when 65,000 men earned \$39,000,000, we represent it to ourselves and others, sometimes, for the purpose of more clearly apprehending the proportion of the sums, by saying each man on an average earned \$600. THIS REPRESENTATION IS ALWAYS A FICTION, but it is ALLOWABLE AND CONVENIENT FOR AIDING OUR CONCEPTIONS OF THE MERE RELATIONS OF QUANTITIES, WHENEVER IT LEADS TO NO PRACTICAL MISAPPREHENSIONS. In comparing the wealth of one community with that of another, it cannot fail to mislead most grossly, as any one can see who will observe the only object or aim of such comparisons. A comparison of the wealth of different nations or communities may be instituted by three distinct classes of inquirers, each having his own peculiar and practical object in view. The statesman investigates the subject to discover the comparative strength of each—the political economist to obtain the means of verifying the laws of his science—the philanthropist to ascertain the condition of the people as to the degree of comparative comfort they enjoy. Now neither of these classes would be aided in their researches by the adoption of the average principle; but EACH WOULD BE LED ASTRAY. The statesman and economist, to attain their respective objects, must both ascertain the comparative aggregates, and their attempt to discover the

comparative aggregates by the comparative averages would in a large mass of cases lead them to results precisely the opposites of truth; for the very causes which in a community increase the average often diminish as we have seen, the aggregate of its wealth. The philanthropist, too, would be led into gross error—for to attain his object he must learn, as far as practicable, the ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY, and this FICTITIOUS average is, in many cases, found to be highest where there exists the LEAST ACTUAL average, where property is most unequally distributed, and where want and misery most abound. The only result, then, which any inquirer on a subject of this kind can expect from the adoption of the average principle as a criterion of national prosperity, is that, while led by it into the most ridiculous and palpable absurdities, he will imagine himself to be making the most wonderful and instructive discoveries, and will call upon all mankind to divest themselves of the results of their united observation, renounce their common sense, adopt his blunders, and admire his genius.

In our next article we propose to present the statistics necessary to a fair and full comparison of the economical results of the slave system of the South, and the free system of the North. JUSTICE.

REVIEW, NO. 2.

We proceed to examine the statistical facts adduced by Mr. Fisher to prove the superior wealth of the South. Whenever he quotes OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, his statistics carry the disproof of his position on their very face—he presents a plausible case ONLY WHEN HE MAKES HIS OWN STATISTICS.

He begins by comparing Maryland and Massachusetts in point of property, stating that they are "of similar territorial extent." Now Maryland, according to the official report of the land-office, contains eleven thousand square miles, and Massachusetts seven thousand two hundred and fifty—so that Maryland lacks only two hundred and fifty square miles of being ONE-THIRD LARGER than Massachusetts. This is a fair specimen of Mr. Fisher's recklessness in the statement of what he calls facts—he asserts, in the calmest and most confident style, that one State is of "similar extent" to another, when it possesses a SMALL FRACTION OVER TWO-THIRDS OF ITS EXTENT. Mr. F. must conceive that, in summing up the wealth of a State, you may leave out of the account all the property contained in one-third of its territory; without vitiating the result, or he must know that his comparison of the wealth of Maryland and Massachusetts, founded on the assertion that they are of the same extent, is calculated to lead to a false conclusion. Whichever of these suppositions may be true, Mr. F. shows himself unfit to be trusted to make statistical comparisons. So, too, in comparing New York and Virginia, he says that they are "not materially unequal in extent." Would any one imagine that their difference in extent amounted to 15,352 MILES IN FAVOR OF VIRGINIA, or that she is so much larger than New York, that, if Massachusetts and New Hampshire were added to the territory of New York, Virginia would still retain a slight territorial superiority?

It must be very gratifying to gentlemen who quote Mr. F. as a great statistician to see these documentary evidences of his accuracy and fairness. We are well aware that any man is liable to blunder occasionally from inadvertence—but Mr. F., by some STRANGE FATALITY, ALWAYS BLUNDERS IN FAVOR OF ONE SIDE; besides, no man

would be pardonable for such gross blunders, in case where, after due reflection and taking his own time to prepare his facts, he comes forward, as Mr. F. does, to CONVICT THE WORLD OF FOLLY IN THEIR JUDGMENTS. When a claim to superior wisdom and documentary accuracy is found to rest on absurd principles and misrepresented facts, mankind have a just right to turn upon their self-constituted instructor, and taunt him with both arrogance and folly. Mr. F. either knew that these States were "materially unequal" or he did not; if he knew it, he made an assertion which he knew to be false—if he did not know it, he is convicted of making a POSITIVE AND IMPORTANT ASSERTION ABOUT A MATTER OF WHICH HE WAS INEXCUSABLY IGNORANT.

But what says Mr. F. as to the wealth of each of these States? He gives the property of Maryland as assessed at \$202,272 650, and that of Massachusetts at \$300,000,000. Here, then, we have the slave State with ONE-THIRD MORE TERRITORY AND ONE-THIRD LESS WEALTH than the free State. If the wealth of Maryland were equal to that of Massachusetts in proportion to her territory, it would be upwards of \$400,000,000, that is, it would be MORE THAN THE DOUBLE OF ITS PRESENT AMOUNT. One would suppose that Massachusetts, thus possessing in proportion to her extent more than twice the wealth of Maryland, might suffice to prove her the richer of the two, and the free system more productive than the slave. Mr. F. evades this conclusion only by the application of that remarkable average principle, discovered by him as the rule of measurement for the prosperity of States, which enabled us in our former article to prove that Russia sixty years ago was the wealthiest nation on the globe.

We may remark here that Maryland is fast approaching the condition of a free State—slavery does not exist in her to such an extent as to prevent her engaging largely in manufactures and commerce, her slaves were reduced at the last census to 89,495, the large mass of her labor is now free labor, and accumulations of capital are rapidly going forward in those parts of her territory where the labor is almost exclusively free. In consequence of this, she is richer in proportion to her size than any of the slave States, and her labor is more productive than theirs. So that compared with her sister slave States she furnishes a strong confirmatory proof of the superiority of free labor.

Mr. F. next undertakes to present the economical statistics of New York and Virginia. He states that the property of New York was, in 1847, assessed at \$632,699,993, and that the property of Virginia is about \$600,000,000. Suppose for a moment that these statements were correct, they would show that New York, with LESS TERRITORY by about ten millions of acres, possessed MORE WEALTH than Virginia. But what is Mr. F.'s documentary evidence that Virginia has \$600,000,000 worth of property? HE HAS NONE—and, instead of AUTHENTIC STATISTICS, he builds his whole argument for the superior wealth of Virginia on SOME ESTIMATE MADE IN 1834 BY PROFESSOR DEW! We remember an article on slavery written about that time

by Prof. Dew, which we suppose is the one that contains this estimate—it was a remarkable production, and we regret the loss of the volume that contained it, as we might there have perhaps been able to learn some new rule for raising the wealth of a State BY ESTIMATES as instructive as Mr. F.'s for raising it by AVERAGES. We have a vivid recollection, however, of the astonishment we felt at the Professor's powers of estimating, as displayed in an estimate he adopted from some one of the cost of transporting an emigrant to Liberia and keeping him there six months. The Colonization Society had been doing it for years at \$60. The Professor, if our recollection serves us, gave the estimate for it at \$200 or \$250. From our recollection of Professor Dew's capabilities in the way of estimating to suit his own purposes, we are by no means inclined to permit Mr. F. to substitute his estimate for an auditor's report, and then claim that he is referring to "the umpirage of document." But Mr. F. is not even satisfied with the Professor's estimate of Virginia's wealth, and in a note he assigns reasons for believing that the amount of it is far greater than the Professor made it. We had proposed showing the monstrous incorrectness of the estimate given as well as the ignorance displayed by Mr. F. in the reasons assigned for the estimate being too low, but we perceive that this work has been already done by another, and so well done as to make any additional remark on this point superfluous. Mr. Mussey, of Cincinnati, has exhibited as satisfactory data as such a case admits of for reducing the estimate of Virginia property to \$400,000,000 at the highest.

But, as Mr. F. has brought forward New York and Virginia, we compare them as far as we have "official statistics" to enable us to do so. Valuations of property in each of these States were taken by the United States authorities in 1799, and again in 1814-15. By comparing these valuations taken at different periods, we can see which State increased its property most rapidly in the fifteen years preceding 1815. The increase in value of the lands and houses of New York in that period amounted to \$168,990,194, in Virginia to \$94,383,072. (See Pitkin, p. 372.) The whole real estate and slaves in 1815 amounted in Virginia to \$263,737,699, in New York to \$273,120,900. Since that period the land and slaves in Virginia have increased comparatively little—the increase of the slaves has been mainly carried off further south, and a large portion of the lands have become more impoverished; while New York, with her gigantic system of internal improvements, that has since that period been called into existence, has risen to be a great empire in wealth and population. Could an estimate that would make Virginia, during this period, keep pace in the advancement of her property with New York be hazarded by any man but a dreamer or a manufacturer of facts?

Mr. F. proceeds next to compare the assessments of Ohio and Kentucky. The auditor's reports show Ohio as possessing \$421,067,991, and Kentucky as possessing \$272,847,696. Thus Ohio, with only 2,284 square miles more than Kentucky, possesses \$148,220,294 more proper-

ty. Exclusive of the value of her slaves, Kentucky has only a LITTLE MORE THAN HALF THE AMOUNT of wealth belonging to her sister State. This is instructive as to the effect of slave labor on the prosperity of a State—especially when it is remembered that, in 1815, in real estate and slaves, Kentucky possessed \$87,018,837, while Ohio possessed but \$61,347,215. Such has been the difference produced between these States, wrought by the different systems of labor, in only 33 years, and let it be remembered that the slave system produces its deteriorating effects more strikingly and rapidly as the country in which it exists grows older. In a new region, where labor is scarce and hardly procurable, slave labor may be profitable; but, as population becomes more dense, the indolent, unskillful, wasteful labor of the slave grows more and more unprofitable as it comes into competition with industry of a higher character.

According to the auditor's reports, the lands of Ohio are worth eleven dollars per acre on an average—those of Kentucky but seven. While Mr. F. is compelled to admit this fact, he attempts to impair its force by a "bold assertion," unwarranted by fact, that the quality of Ohio land is to that extent superior, "because there is a large mountain region in Kentucky for which Ohio has no equivalent." But our mountain land could be turned to good account if slavery did not prevent Kentucky from becoming a populous State, while Ohio has vast tracts of irreclaimable swamp, which, added to her eastern hills and her lowlands around the lake subject to inundation, are a full equivalent to our mountain region. We may say, too, without boasting, that the great central mass of fertile lands in the heart of our State, to which Ohio has "no equivalent," would more than equalize the average intrinsic worth of our lands to the average of the lands of Ohio. But is Mr. F. so totally ignorant of the causes that effect the price of lands as not to know that lands thinly peopled, and with few towns and cities to create a home market for their products, will always bear a much lower price than lands densely inhabited and thickly interspersed with villages and flourishing cities? The effect of slavery on the price of land is seen more strikingly by comparing the older slave with the older free States. Thus, from the assessments of 1815, we learn that the lands of Pennsylvania ranged at \$29 per acre—those of Virginia at \$4.15. Even then, while the upper part of New York was still a wilderness, its whole lands averaged \$16.50—those of North Carolina \$2.50—those of South Carolina \$8—and those of New Jersey \$35. It only needs the banishment of slavery from our soil to raise our lands to a price higher than that of the lands of Ohio, and add at least \$96,460,800 to the value of our soil. Thus, by retaining the institution of slavery, we are losers in a single item, the inferior price of our lands, by an amount equal to the whole estimated value of the slaves, and \$36,000,000 besides.

* Having examined all the statistics brought forward by Mr. F. to prove the superiority of southern enterprise and capital for the accumulation of wealth, we can easily now discover the

reasons for Mr. F.'s apparently absurd choice of Virginia as the specimen of southern prosperity. In her case he has two advantages for giving plausibility to his views. 1. Virginia has a comparatively small white population; and the smaller the white population is, the larger is the average of wealth, by Mr. F.'s rule. 2. He is not cramped by any OFFICIAL statements in his estimates of the amount of her property. When King James, on his accession to the English throne, learned that he had the appointing of the bishops and the judges, who expounded the Bible and the statutes, he exclaimed with glee in his broad Scotch dialect—"then I mak the gospel and I mak the law." Mr. F. feels the same consciousness of power over his conclusions that the vain and foolish monarch felt that he possessed over the law and gospel, and on the same ground—for he knows that he MAKES THE STATISTICS ON WHICH HIS CONCLUSIONS DEPEND. The people of Kentucky, however, can appreciate the value of the wealth which slavery confers; when they learn that this wealth will increase, just in proportion as Kentucky approaches in her condition to the present condition of old Virginia. Kentucky, Mr. Fisher teaches us, is now only a little more than HALF AS PROSPEROUS as Virginia—each of us is worth \$456, but each Virginian is worth \$758.

The most important class of facts connected with the settlement of the comparative economical value of free and slave labor is one which Mr. F. has skillfully kept out of sight—he makes no allusion to the existence of these facts, except, in a single instance, in which he misrepresents a portion of them. The class of facts to which we refer are those that exhibit the amount of annual products in these several States.

When we wish to compare the economical effects of two systems of labor, it would seem to be almost impossible that any candid man, of ordinary capacity, should fail to perceive that the readiest, surest, and only correct mode of doing it, is to compare *the amount of annual products yielded under each system*. If, in proportion to the number of persons employed, labor under one of these systems is found to yield a smaller annual return, that system must be condemned, unless it can be shown that its laborers worked under disadvantages arising from causes extrinsic to the nature of the system. This natural and fair mode of comparison Mr. F. has shunned. He can plead no lack of materials for instituting this comparison. The details of the census of 1840 furnished him with sufficient means of comparing the production of the Northern and Southern States in two, at least, of the great branches of industry—agriculture and manufactures. The amount produced in each of these branches is given for each State in the Union. A comparison of the respective amounts of their annual production is not only desirable, with a view of ascertaining on which system capital and labor yield the best return, but also with a view of ascertaining, as far as practicable, the actual relative conditions of the two sets of people, in regard to their possession of the means of subsistence and the comforts of

life. With these views it is more important than to ascertain their relative amounts of capital. The comfortable condition of a man or a community depends *more on his income than on his capital*—on his actual annual products than on estimates of property, which often yields nothing.

To furnish, then, full and satisfactory evidence of the comparative results of the free and slave labor systems, as well as of the comparative conditions of the people of the two sections, we append to this article a set of tables compiled from the census of 1840. These exhibit a view of the annual product of each of the old States of the Union, Vermont not included, as well as Ohio and Kentucky. The annual returns for the industry and capital engaged in commerce are not given in the census, to the great disadvantage of the North in this comparison, for her returns derived from commerce are very great, while those of the South are very small. To enable each one to see for himself how great this deficiency is, and to remedy it by his own estimation, we have given columns showing the amount of capital and the number of hands employed in this branch. From these it can be seen how much superior the income of the North must be from this source. In making out such tables perfect accuracy is impossible—all that *any statistics of this sort* aim to give is an *approximation*. The tables given in the American Almanac and Auditors' Reports are made up in the same way. The sum total of each product being given, it is multiplied by an average price to find its entire value. The danger of inaccuracy arises from fixing on wrong average prices, or the average price may do injustice to the products of one section, as it may be below *their actual* price, while it is above the actual price in another section. To show the fairness of the calculations, we append a list of the prices of the chief articles. On comparing them with the prices affixed to the same articles in the report of the commissioner of patents, we find that they are generally lower for the most important products of the North, and higher for the chief staples of the South. The price is the average price which the article would command at the place where it is produced—wheat where it is raised; cotton and rice where they are raised. They do more than justice to Southern production in these tables in another respect. The same agricultural products, raised equally in two different districts of country, always command a higher price where there are large cities, a dense population, and abundant facilities for cheap transportation. When an average price then is fixed on an article raised in common both by the North and South, it works disadvantageously for the North, for it represents the value of their product in money at *less than it really is*, while it represents the value of the Southern products as *greater than it is*. The Northern product sells for more and the Southern for less than the average price, as the former is raised near a better market.

In a few of the manufactured articles only the capital was given in the census and not the

annual product. In these cases, estimates of the value of the products were made by taking the ratio of products of capital in similar cases.

Several other tables are given, which are interesting in themselves, and for which we shall have occasion in a future article, such as the proportion of children at school in each State and the proportion who can neither read nor write.

Many reflections will occur to observing minds on examining these tables. To a few points we wish to direct special attention.

1. Observe the greater productiveness of the free labor system, as exhibited in the superior value of the aggregate agricultural products made on a much smaller territory and by very few more hands:

	Square miles.	No. of agricultural laborers.	Products.
Eight old free States.....	129,081	1,040,238	235,959,000
Six old slave do	205,972	1,935,207	133,165,000

Now how can this remarkable inferiority in the amount of products off a far larger territory, worked by nearly as many hands, be accounted for, if it is not owing to the *nature of the system of slavery*? It is a system of wasteful, unskillful, indolent, and impoverishing labor. The soil and climate of the South are vastly most favorable to agriculture than those of the North, so that every natural advantage is enjoyed by the Southern laborer. Is it said that the lands of the free States are more highly improved? It is granted, but that only proves the superiority of her cultivation. Is it said that more capital is vested in the agriculture of the North? But to what are the accumulations of capital owing but to the superior thrift and industry of free labor? No cause of the difference in the amounts of the respective products of the North and the South can be assigned which does not resolve itself into the difference of the systems of labor. And this difference would have been far greater had not the general quality of her soil and the genialness of her climate given such great original advantages to the South.

2. We may gain a clearer and more definite conception of the superior productiveness of free labor if we compare individual States, between whose circumstances there is any resemblance. Take Virginia, for example, Mr. Fisher's favorite specimen of prosperity, and the most flourishing community in the world, according to his conceptions, and compare its agricultural success with that of New York or Pennsylvania. Mr. F. regards agriculture as the source of all wealth, and regards Southern slavery as an economical blessing to the South, because it prevents the South from ever engaging in manufactures and confines it to agricultural pursuits, which are, as he says, ever the most profitable. If then, it can be made clear that slave labor, as compared with free, injures agriculture, the glory must depart from slavery.

	Square miles.	Agricultural laborers.	Products.
Virginia-----	61,352	320,766	48,444,000
New York-----	46,000	457,852	100,955,000
Pennsylvania	47,000	212,136	66,431,000

Average per acre. Average per hand.

Virginia-----	\$1 23	\$151
New York-----	3 41	220
Pennsylvania----	2 20	311

Virginia and Pennsylvania have larger ranges of unproductive, or at least, uncultivated land, than are to be found now in New York, though, in this latter State, there are still immense tracts of wild land. This fact makes it natural that there should be, in each of these States, a lower average product per acre than in New York. But the average of Pennsylvania, with as large a proportion of mountain land and a much harsher climate, ranges far above the average of Virginia—in the ratio of \$2 20 to \$1 23—not far from double. But the most important fact to be noted, from its direct bearing on the great question before us, is the fact that the free labor of New York yields \$220 per hand, that of Pennsylvania \$311, while the slave labor of Virginia yields but \$151. The agricultural lands of Pennsylvania have been longer settled than the larger portion of those of New York, and, as they are more highly improved, each laborer on them works to better advantage and produces more. The lands of Virginia have been still longer settled, but, instead of being more highly improved, they are impoverished by slave labor, and, consequently, yield much less. Place the slave on the lands of Pennsylvania, and, though he would not raise an amount equal to that raised by men who work for themselves and their own families, he would unquestionably raise, for a time, more than he does on the lands he has exhausted, but, in a period of years, the best lands will degenerate under his cultivation—the pressure of his indolent foot takes its prolific virtue out of even the most fertile soil.

We might compare Massachusetts with South Carolina. The one exclusively agricultural, the other devoting her capital and energies to manufactures and commerce—the productions of the one fostered and expanded by the warm breezes of the South; the productions of the other chilled and stunted by the cold blasts of the North—yet, with all her disadvantages, the free labor of Massachusetts draws from her hard soil \$167 to the hand, and \$296 to the acre, while the slavery of South Carolina produces \$81 to the hand, and 75 cents to the acre.

Were it not from the apprehension of wearying the reader we might carry out this investigation and show, in every instance where the circumstances would warrant a comparison, the superiority of free labor. Its triumph would be, perhaps, most strikingly exhibited by comparing minutely the product, soil, and climate of the New England States with those of the most flourishing of the old Southern States. The industry, skill, and economy of the freeman extracts a living even from the granite rocks of New Hampshire. Place a family of twenty slaves on 1000 acres of her niggardly soil, and leave them unassisted, with their habits of labor, to derive a subsistence from the products of the land—what would be their fate? Would there be flesh enough upon their bones at the end of

a year, even to furnish a hearty meal for a carter's crew?

The only apparent anomaly in the results of these tables is, that the Rhode Island agriculturists are represented as producing but \$107 per hand, while per acre the land yields \$226. The way in which we account for this, by an error in the census, it is unnecessary for any practical purpose to detail. Perfect accuracy in the best census or assessment we cannot expect; still these documents are, in the main, reliable sources of information, and incomparably preferable to the vague and wild conjectures of theorists like Mr. Fisher and Professor Dew.

3. Observe the contrast of the two sections in their respective amounts of manufactures.

The South \$48 461,000

The North \$276,532,000.

Mark, too, the comparative amounts of capital embarked in commerce and fisheries, and judge of the comparative returns.

The South \$61,563,000

The North \$206,452,000.

The manufactures of the North yield nearly six times the product of those of the South, and her commercial capital is more than three times as great. How loudly do these results speak in favor of that system of labor which regards man as something more than a mere chattel, a mere animated machine, to be owned and worked by another. But on this branch of the subject it is needless to dwell, for Mr. F. gives up the point here, and admits indirectly that nearly the whole profits of manufactures must be forever shut out from a country in which slavery exists to the extent which he deems most conducive to prosperity. He tries to weaken the force of this admission by depreciating the value of manufactures as a source of wealth, and attempts to show that instead of enriching they impoverish and degrade a community. We reserve, for a subsequent article, some remarks on the sagacious and profound views of Mr. F. on this branch of economical science.

We need scarcely observe, after our explanation, in a former article, of the occasions on which the use of averages was justifiable, that we have used them above merely for convenience of conception and brevity of expression. The results are the same for any practical object, whether in these cases we take the averages or the aggregates—the object is to show which system yields most off the same number of acres and with the same number of laborers.

As a corroboration of the results of our comparison of the products of the North and the South, we quote from "President Ruffner's Address to the People of West Virginia," a passage containing the results of similar comparisons made by himself and by Professor Tucker of the University of Virginia. Their estimates of the values of some articles differ from ours—their results consequently exhibit some variations from ours, as they do from each other—but we quote it to show that NO SUCH DIFFERENCES OF PRICE AS MAY BE TAKEN BY DIFFERENT MEN WHO WISH TO REACH THE TRUTH CAN ALTER THE GENERAL RESULT. Different estimates founded on the census tables may cause some difference as to the SPECIFIC AMOUNT OF THE SUPERIORITY OF NORTHERN OVER SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE—but there can be no difference as to the important fact that the SUPERIORITY IS VERY GREAT.

"The general results, according to both Mr. Tucker," (who, as he states, was certainly not partial to the North in his estimates,) "and ourselves, are as follows: In New England, agricultural industry yields an annual value av-

eraging about \$180 to the hand, that is, for each person employed.

"In the Middle States, of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, the average is about two hundred and sixty five or two hundred and seventy dollars to the hand.

"And in the old slave States south of the Potomac, the average is about \$130 to the hand. This, according to our calculation, is rather above the average for East Virginia, but below that for West Virginia. The average of all Virginia is about \$138. Thus it appears, by the best evidence which the case admits of, that the farmers of the Middle States, with their free labor, produce more than twice as great a value to the hand, as the farmers and planters of the old slave States; and that even the New Englanders, on their poor soils and under their wintry sky, make nearly forty per cent. more, to the hand, than the old Southerners make in the sunny South, with the advantage of their valuable staples, cotton and tobacco. In Maryland, the result is intermediate between the average of the North and that of the South; and this agrees strikingly with her condition as a half slave State; for lower Maryland is cultivated by negroes, and has a languishing agriculture, as well as a stationary population; but upper Maryland is cultivated by free labor, and has a thriving agriculture with a growing population.

"These results, founded on the best evidence and confirmed by general observation, are, for substance, indubitably correct, and cannot be overthrown."

Our estimates of prices have been somewhat lower in the general and somewhat more favorable to the South; but the ratios of the different amounts per hand, in three different sections, are so near to those of President Ruffner and Professor Tucker as to exhibit strikingly the fact that any reasonable calculation must reach the same result. The average value produced by a hand in our tables is, in New England \$166.80, in the Middle States \$250, and in the old slave States south of the Potomac \$121.60.

We taxed Mr. Fisher with misrepresenting the facts in the only allusion he made to the comparative amounts of the annual products of the North and the South. Here is his statement. (See page 8 of Lecture): "According to the census returns of 1840, Virginia, with a free population of less than one-third of that of New York, and a capital something less, produced from the various branches of her industry more than half the products of New York; and as the total population of Virginia, slave and free, is only about half that of New York, it is clear that, after deducting the annual consumption of both, Virginia will have a larger proportional surplus remaining to augment the stock of her permanent property.

That any man in his senses could make such a statement, with the census before him, can be accounted for only on the principle that there are some men of such peculiar mental power, that a fact in their hands is like clay in the hands of the potter—IT ASSUMES WHAT SHAPE THEY PLEASE TO GIVE IT; they are creative geniuses, differing from poets only in their possession of a higher and more valuable power, for, while poets can only create fictions, they can create facts.

By looking at the annexed table, any one will see that even the agricultural product of Virginia, with nearly three-fourths of the agricultural laborers, and larger territory, DOES NOT REACH THE HALF of the agricultural products of New York, while the products of her manufactures are between ONE-FOURTH and ONE-FIFTH of those of New York; and unless Virginia commerce is more prosperous than that of New York, in proportion to its amount (and of this all men can easily judge), the product of this branch of her industry must be also A LITTLE MORE THAN ONE-FIFTH of that of New York, as she has only one-fifth as much capital employed in it—The facetious editor of "Punch" has entertained mankind by presenting them with a series of sketches of "model" characters, as "the model husband," "the model wife," "the model lodger," &c.—if he should meet with Mr. Fisher he might add to his series the sketch of "the model statistician." Can any one, too, divine what Mr. F. meant by introducing so specially into his statement the fact that Virginia, while producing comparatively so much, had less than a third of the free population of New York?

The fact introduced in this connection seems capable of conveying only one of two intimations—which he intended is a mystery to us. Did he mean to intimate that the free Virginians, though only a third of the New Yorkers in number, did half their amount of work? But this

seems to be ridiculous, when we remember that the glory of Virginia lies in her doing her work by her slaves—we can scarcely, then, suppose that Mr. F. meant to represent that the free population of Virginia, small as it is comparatively, raised all the products, without the aid of their slaves, and thus surpassed the industry of New York. His other possible meaning is that their industry had availed the Virginians much more than the industry of New York had profited its inhabitants, because, with HALF THE AMOUNT OF THE PRODUCT OF New York, Virginia had only to SUPPORT ONE-THIRD OF THE POPULATION. But this would seem to be rather an inhuman meaning, as it would imply that the slaves who did nearly all the work were to be starved after it was done, and, indeed, in a subsequent part of the sentence, Mr. F. admits by implication that the slaves ought to be permitted to eat. Whether Mr. F. had a ridiculous meaning, or an inhuman meaning, or simply no meaning at all, in this flourish about the proportion of free population, we leave to our readers to decide—we confess ourselves perplexed.

JUSTICE

[illegible]

States.	Ohio.	Kentucky.	New Hampshire.	Massachusetts.	Rhode Island.	Connecticut.	Vermont.	New York.	Pennsylvania.	New Jersey.	Delaware.	Maryland.	Virginia.	North Carolina.	South Carolina.	Georgia.	Free S. without Ohio.	S. S. without Kentucky.	Total.
Value of live stock.	39,731,000	32,437,000	4,932,000	6,686,000	966,000	5,035,000	9,008,000	51,650,000	34,343,000	6,815,000	1,334,000	7,867,000	31,019,000	19,143,000	18,442,000	21,203,000	8 Free S. without Ohio.	6 S. S. without Kentucky.	Total.
Annual increase of same at 20 per cent.	7,931,000	6,487,000	996,000	1,337,000	193,000	1,011,000	1,801,000	10,330,000	6,868,000	1,333,000	276,000	1,573,000	6,239,000	3,828,000	2,968,000	4,240,000			
Total annual value of all agricultural products—including INCREASE of stock, products of forests, gardens, mines, &c.	56,303,000	34,833,000	11,282,000	14,811,000	1,772,000	10,058,000	17,559,000	100,955,000	66,431,000	13,061,000	2,033,000	12,609,000	48,441,000	25,737,000	15,908,000	28,445,000	235,959,000	133,165,000	369,124,000
Total annual value of manufactured articles.	28,680,000	10,088,000	9,762,000	66,450,000	13,074,000	18,292,000	5,005,000	82,049,000	62,303,000	19,603,000	3,142,000	13,842,000	18,882,000	4,203,000	4,738,000	3,634,000	276,532,000	48,431,000	724,964,000

REVIEW NO. 3.

Before finally dismissing Mr. F.'s statistical argument of the comparative wealth of the North and the South, we would remark that there is an entire want of fairness in his mode of presenting the question that he discusses. When a writer, of a clear head, intends to controvert or defend any proposition he states it *clearly and distinctly*—and then *adheres to his original statement*. When a writer, fond of paradox and sophistry, undertakes to maintain one of his paradoxes or sophisms, he is very apt to resort to the logical trick of stating his proposition at first *strongly* but *incidentally*, showing his readers by a *kind of side view* what he is going to prove. After lodging in their minds this impression of his object, he writes on for a time *around and about the subject*, until he gets an opportunity of adroitly presenting a proposition as the one to be discussed, which, while it *looks like* the former, is *essentially a different one*. Most readers will not notice the change, and will imagine him to be arguing the proposition which he had first led them to believe he was about to maintain. Mr. F. appears to understand thoroughly this logical artifice—for, while he professes to have but one question before him, he in reality presents, as it suits the exigencies of his argument, *three essentially different questions*. We can scarcely credit the idea that a gentleman, deserving the ecomiums bestowed by those acquainted with him on his metaphysical and logical ability, could have failed to perceive that these were entirely different questions.

His first presentation of the point which he is about to controvert is a forcible and clear but *incidental* presentation. He tells us that the South is considered as declining, "and that negro slavery has with extraordinary unanimity been fixed on as the great and efficient cause of Southern decline. And it is now assumed that

the South, particularly the older States, is undergoing the process of impoverishment, depopulation, and decay." After leading the minds of his readers to believe that *this is the question* at issue, and intimating that there was a *universal mistake about the facts*, he dexterously shuffles in a totally different question in the room of the one which he had intimated that he was about to discuss. His second presentation of the question is given in these words: "Yet, in opposition to the existing opinion on the subject, I maintain that the South is greatly the superior of the North in wealth, in proportion to the number of their *citizens* respectively." Now "the existing opinion on this subject," which Mr. F. undertook to rectify, was that "the old South was undergoing a process of impoverishment, depopulation, and decay." He felt himself to be unable to controvert this opinion, without misrepresenting it, and this he does, by giving us to understand that it is *identical with the opinion that the South is inferior to the North in the comparative average wealth of their respective citizens*. The fact is, that the very causes which produced the impoverishment, produced at the same time a *greater comparative average*, and no one doubted this fact. But, after thus changing the question on pages 6 and 7—not by a fair, open, and manly statement of it in three different forms, but covertly and sophistically, he is still not satisfied, and on page 10 he presents *another question* as the one that he is discussing—"the question is," says he, "which is the most profitable investment of capital—in land and slaves, as is usual in the slaveholding States—or in land alone, or commerce and manufactures, as in the Northern States." Now this is an important question, and it is incidentally closely connected with the subject—but it is *not the question which Mr. F. undertook to discuss*. There may be modes of investing capital profitable to individuals for a season, but destructive to the wealth and prosperity of a community, and there may be modes of investments which while they are *favorable neither to the wealth of the individual nor the community, are still such as to produce a higher average of wealth by driving away the laboring class of that community*. We think that this can be demonstrably shown to be the case with investments in slaves in the general, except in a country where other labor cannot be procured. It suited Mr. F.'s purpose at a particular turn of the argument to present this as the question which he had engaged in discussing. This shifting of questions is never practised by a fair-minded and clear-headed reasoner. As to this last question which Mr. F. presents to our notice, any one can decide on the profitableness of the Southern mode of investments as a whole by comparing the respective amounts of capital in Virginia and Massachusetts and New York, with their respective amounts of annual products as given by the census tables. He will thus see that the Southern investments yielded in the old States comparatively much less for those who are to be supported off its proceeds. There is also another mode of testing this question, viz: by comparing the incomes of persons of a given amount of

capital in land and slaves in the old South, with the incomes of persons of equal capital engaged in the industrial occupations of the North. But into this branch of the argument we have not room to enter—it has been already ably discharged by a Southerner, who has shown that the Southern investment is far less productive.

Having now concluded our remarks on Mr. F.'s pretended demonstration of the fact of the superiority of the South in point of wealth, we proceed to examine his mode of *accounting* for this superiority. His statistical evidence he recognizes to be "not enough to satisfy the mind," and "acknowledges that it is incumbent on whoever attempts to overthrow a popular error to show not only that it *is* such, but that it *must be such*, on the recognized principles of human judgment."

If the wealth of the South was really superior to that of the North, there are two very manifest causes which would have suggested themselves as accounting for it—or as the only possible causes that could. One is, that the natural advantages of the South, for agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, were greater than those of the North, and the other that the Southern laborers, the slaves, were more skillful, industrious, and economical than the freemen of the North. But neither of these causes is presented. Mr. F. dared not present the last as the cause, for he felt it to be too gross an insult to the common intelligence of men to assert it as a fact, that the slave is superior as a laborer to the freeman—and he was unwilling to present the other possible cause, viz: superior natural advantages of the South, for this might at least lead to the suspicion that their wealth was greater *in spite of their slavery*, and not *in virtue of it*. The South, as all concede, has greatly the advantage of the North in climate and soil, as well as in manufacturing and commercial facilities. If she was richer, these advantages might explain to us why she was so. But Mr. F.'s object is to glorify slavery, and he must therefore invent some cause which will redound to the credit of "the peculiar institution." No man before reading Mr. F. would probably have imagined the cause that he assigns—it is, that *commerce and manufactures are not so profitable as agriculture, or that capital and labor applied to manufacturing and commercial pursuits are comparatively unproductive*. Here we have a beautiful specimen of Mr. F.'s powers of imagination—he conjures up an *imaginary cause* to account for an *imaginary fact*. Slavery is allowed to be inconsistent with the existence of manufactures and commerce. This formerly was considered by all men to be a proof that the system was unfavorable to the accumulation of wealth—"Oh no! gentlemen," virtually exclaims Mr. F., addressing the erring world, "you are sadly stupid, not to have found that the exclusion of commerce and manufactures enriches a community, and that the glory of the peculiar institution is that it protects every community in which it exists from becoming impoverished by these profitless pursuits." One might, at first view, conceive, to use an Oriental expression, that Mr. F. was "laughing at our beards."

But when we examine more closely we find that he does not promulge his theory as a joke—he seems to be in dead earnest, and covers nearly six closely printed pages to prove that communities exclusively devoted to agriculture as the South is, must become much richer, in communities which, like the North, mingle commercial and manufacturing pursuits with their agricultural industry.

The French economists, some hundred years ago, before political economy had become a science, held the doctrine that agriculture was the source of all wealth. The doctrine had sickened and died under the advancing light that the investigations of political economy had thrown upon it; but Mr. F. has exhumed the buried carcass to aid him in sustaining the cause of slavery. There is truly a felicitous congruity between the dogma and the cause which it has been brought forth to defend—a scientific absurdity long dead and buried evoked from its grave to support a sham statistical fact. We hesitated for some time as to any necessity for using arguments in disproof of a theory which has so long “said to the worm thou art my brother, and to corruption thou art my sister.” But that Mr. F.’s admirers may see that his *economical philosophy* is as little to be relied on as his *economical statistics*, we will give a little attention to this philosophical explanation of the accumulation of wealth. *The whole industrial history of nations is a refutation of Mr. F.’s theory.* Not a single nation, in any age or clime, relying solely or mainly on agriculture, has become distinguished for its wealth; while, in every period, nations have risen to the highest pitch of opulence, who have owed their eminence mainly, and in some cases exclusively, to their commerce and manufactures. Let the reader of history recall to mind the nations which, in the successive ages of the world, have been renowned for their riches, and he will be able to estimate the merits of a theory built upon the assumption that agriculture is the real source of national wealth, and that in proportion as a State devotes any part of its industry and capital to manufactures and commerce, in that proportion must it fall behind its exclusively agricultural neighbor in the career of prosperity.

Ireland has nearly three of her people engaged in agriculture to one engaged in commerce and manufactures, while England has more than two employed in the latter pursuits to one engaged in agriculture—that is, Ireland in proportion to her population has more than six times as much of her industry and capital devoted to this “most profitable pursuit.” (See McCulloch’s statistics of B. Empire, 2d v., 524.) According to Mr. F.’s theory of the creation of wealth, Ireland ought to possess a much larger portion of it than England. But the Irish, Mr. F. may plead, are oppressed by various evils and have not a fair chance for showing the superior productiveness of agriculture. Take France, then, an eminently agricultural country, naturally much more fertile and rich than England. Two-thirds of its laborers are engaged in agriculture; yet, for its extent and

population, its wealth is small compared with that of England, of whose laboring population less than one-third is engaged in what Mr. F. deems the most profitable species of industry. Indeed, if Mr. F.’s theory were correct, Poland now pre-eminent for her comparative poverty, would stand conspicuous among the nations of the earth for her opulence, as she has no commerce, and of manufactures she has next to none; while Holland, on the other hand, whose main resources have ever been the ocean and the factory, ought to be among the poorest of countries. Holland, owing to the accumulated mass of capital which commerce and manufactures (but mainly commerce) has yielded to her, has been for some hundreds of years, and she still continues to be, in spite of all her vicissitudes, the most opulent of European nations—Poland is perhaps the poorest. What a grand feat of philosophical legerdemain it would be to theorize Holland into poverty and Poland into wealth! It would even surpass the exploit performed by Mr. F. when, by his peculiar creation and use of statistics, he made New York and Virginia change places in the scale of economical prosperity, and proved the comparative penury and decay of the Empire State as contrasted with the affluence and improvement of the Old Dominion. By the aid of this principle, together with another which he lays down on page 22, viz: that conquests “indicate the superior resources of the conquerors more than their bravery,” Mr. F. has discovered and disclosed to mankind some interesting facts hitherto unknown to history. “Athens,” says he, “was overcome by Sparta, Greece, by Macedon, Carthage by Rome, events which indicate the superior resources of the conquerors more than their bravery.” Truly may philosophy be called divine, when it thus not only enables Mr. F. to pour new light upon present events and present conditions and show mankind that they have totally misconceived objects with which they were daily familiar, mistaking prosperity for adversity, and growth for decay, but enables him even to *illuminate the darkness of past ages*, and disclose conditions of things which had escaped the observation of the acute cotemporary historians of Greece and Rome. Little did Xenophon and Polybius and Livy suspect the existence of those facts which Mr. F.’s philosophy has revealed to us, viz: that the Spartans, living on black broth and using iron money, were richer than the luxurious manufactures and traders of Athens; that semi-barbarous and agricultural Macedon was superior in resources to civilized and commercial Greece; and that the wealth of Rome in the time of the Punic wars exceeded that of Carthage! Poor Nieburh! he lived too soon, or he might have derived great advantage from this principle, in his searching analysis of the early history of Rome. The future critic, however, will be aided by it. Mr. F. himself will probably, by means of it, in his next edition, rectify a mistake under which mankind are laboring in regard to the Goths, Vandals, Burgundies, Lombards, and other northern barbarians, who conquered and divided the Roman Empire. They

have always been represented as poor and destitute of the ordinary comforts of life, as stimulated to their conquests by a deficiency of "resources" and a desire to relieve their poverty by plunder. But as these conquerors were purely agriculturists, while the conquered Romans were partly engaged in commerce and manufactures, Mr. F., by the application of two of his "recognized principles of human judgment," can show that, before they left their seats, they must have been *much richer than the Romans*.

Take another refutation of Mr. F.'s theory. The productiveness of any pursuit is measured by the amount which it yields of interest to the capitalist and wages to the laborers engaged in it. Now will any man pretend that the interest yielded on capital, invested in manufactures and commerce, in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, or Pennsylvania, is, on the whole, lower than the interest yielded on capital invested in agriculture either in those States or in Virginia? Or that the wages of operatives employed in manufactures is less than the wages of agricultural laborers? Is not the very reverse true, as a general rule? It is impossible for obvious reasons, to produce reliable statistics, showing the average RETURN ON CAPITAL INVESTED in manufactures and commerce; but NO ESTIMATE makes it as low as the average return on capital invested in land either in our older States or in England. THE WAGES afforded by the two pursuits CAN BE EASILY COMPARED, AND THE COMPARISON SHOWS THE GREATER PRODUCTIVENESS OF MANUFACTURES. In England the wages of agricultural laborers vary from \$1 88 to \$2 34 per week, while the wages of operatives in manufactories vary from \$1 77 to \$8 88 per week. (See Pictorial History of England.) McCulloch, p. 694, in relation to the cotton factories, says "the wages of adults in factories are generally high, many of them earning from three shillings and six pence to seven shillings and six pence per day, and some more. Employment in factories is also remarkably steady, not depending, like work carried on out of doors, on the state of the weather or other uncertain contingencies, but is prosecuted almost without interruption. Hence the superior condition of the factory work-people." The average wages at Lowell, as given in the Journal of March 28, from the Lowell Courier, is, "for females, \$2 per week, clear of board; males, 80 cents per day." Where does agricultural labor average anything like this the year through? Besides, there is a larger amount of manufacturing industry that yields far higher wages than those received by these factory hands. There were on deposit in the two savings institutions of Lowell about \$880,000; most of the depositors in both banks being the factory operatives. The great advance in wages, commanded by superior skill and ingenuity, give, in manufactures, a stimulus to the cultivation of these qualities not enjoyed by the agricultural laborer. In agriculture there is comparatively little scope for the employment of the most valuable kinds of labor—its proceeds must then naturally be less.

Further, the application of the principle of the

division of labor and the application of the discoveries of modern science to the improvement of the machinery employed in manufactures and the facilitating of the operations of commerce, have given to the human agency engaged in those pursuits an increase of power in the creation of valuable products, to which nothing in the labors of agriculture furnishes us with a parallel. A bushel of coal will enable a steam engine to do the work that twenty men would require a day to perform. In 1825 the spinning machinery of Lancashire alone produced as much yarn as would have required the labor, for a year, of twenty-one million three hundred and twenty thousand persons to produce with the distaff and spindle. (See Results of Machinery, p. 103.) The processes of agriculture are such as admit of comparatively little aid from the division of labor and the improvements in machinery—hence the vast increase of modern wealth has been mainly ascribed by all intelligent political economists to the almost incredible extension of manufactures and commerce, which has resulted from the aid given to these branches of industry by the wonderful scientific discoveries of recent times, and the increased subdivision of labor applied to their various processes. The immense wealth produced by her increased manufactures enabled England, during the many years of the last continental wars, to bear burdens which would have crushed all the agricultural States of Europe—yet the increased development of her manufactures and commerce not only enabled her to defray her unparalleled expenditures, but even brought her through them richer than she was before.

It is really refreshing to read Mr. F.'s arguments in proof of the superior productiveness of agriculture. He appears to be entirely innocent of all knowledge of the principles of political economy, a science which we had thought that gentlemen of the South Carolina school particularly patronized. He talks about "the fecundity of nature never being rivalled by art"—"a grain of wheat producing an hundred fold"—"commerce and manufactures being chiefly artificial, and agriculture for the most part the work of nature;" when the question is simply, which of two kinds of labor, working with the same amount of capital, will yield the most valuable result? Will a given quantity of labor, employing those agencies of nature which aid man in raising agricultural products, yield a larger amount of value to the amounts of capital invested, than the same quantity of labor employing those agencies of nature which aid in the production of manufactured articles? Does the man that manages the steam engine and brings its tremendous energies to aid him in the production of wealth realize less from his labor than he who holds the plow or handles the hoe? Do a set of men, who buy a piece of ground and avail themselves of those qualities of the earth, air, and sun which aid them to raise a crop of corn or wheat, make more clear profit, in proportion to the capital and labor, than another set who purchase a pound of iron at the cost of a cent, and availing themselves of its peculiar qualities,

make it undergo various changes, and finally work it up into 7,650 balance-springs for watches, which they sell for upwards of \$4,000?

Nearly every sentence which Mr. F. has written on this point displays an ignorance of the laws of production which forbids the idea of his becoming enlightened in any other way but by the purchase and study of some work on the subject—even an elementary work will teach him enough to save him hereafter from many of his blunders. When he studies such a work, he will learn that under some CIRCUMSTANCES agriculture is the most profitable pursuit for a man or nation, under OTHERS manufactures, and under OTHERS commerce. He will also learn why it is that manufactures, where they have naturally grown up in connection with agriculture, USUALLY, but NOT INVARIABLY, yield a larger return both to labor and capital engaged in them, and why it is that a nation or State which adopts a system that limits the industry of its people to agriculture employments, excluding manufactures and commerce must necessarily continue poor, stopping at the first stage of its progress toward national wealth.

To establish the truth of his theory, Mr. F. recognized it to be essential not only to reform the common notions of mankind as to the sources of wealth, but also to destroy "the popular error that cities are the peculiar abodes of wealth and property, and that the States where they abound are more flourishing than others." He says that "the world is a great believer in appearances," and he, as one who believes only in realities and always sees things as they are, kindly undertakes to give the par-blind world the benefit of his superior vision. He therefore discloses to us the remarkable fact that his power of seeing realities has enabled him to discover that the luxurious entertainments, varied amusements, fine dresses, rich furniture, brilliant equipages, splendid private buildings, and magnificent public buildings to be found in cities are not proofs of wealth, but ONLY CAUSES AND SIGNS OF POVERTY! What a fatal gift to a philanthropist must be this power of vision with which Mr. F. seems to be endowed. When he sees a broad river flowing past him he discovers no evidences of the numerous, copious, and unfailing springs from which its flood of waters issues, diffusing fertility as it rolls along—he sees only a vast body OF WATER WASTED, A SIGN AND A CAUSE OF STERILITY TO THE COUNTRY THROUGH WHICH IT ROLLS. When he sees a child bounding and leaping in the flush and delight of its conscious and growing energies, he discovers NO SIGNS OF VITALITY AND HEALTH—he sees only the CAUSES OF EXHAUSTION AND DECAY—visions of disease and death rise before his appalled imagination. The prophetess Cassandra, with her fatal endowment, had a happy lot compared with that of Mr. Fisher.

On a subsequent page, however, we find that the palpable wealth of cities forces itself, in some degree at least, even upon the eye of our philosopher. He is compelled PARTIALLY THOUGH NOT FULLY, to admit the truth, when he reluctantly acknowledges that "the average wealth of

cities is generally greater than that of the rest of the people in the State and almost equals that of prosperous agricultural States!" But mark the wonderful discovery by which he conceives that he saves his theory. "This wealth," says he, "is not the product of city employments. It results from the influx into the city of persons who have become rich in the country, and who resort to the cities because they cannot carry on agricultural operations extensively in the free States. This results from the high price of agricultural labor in free States, and its irregularity. An industrious laborer on a farm soon acquires enough money to buy a tract of land and emigrate. Hence a farmer who acquires some wealth in these States, and finds it difficult to extend his operations in the country, resorts to commercial operations and settles in town." Let us for a moment examine this piece of reasoning, and point out its contradictions and absurdities. In the first sentence he gives us to understand that city employments do not produce wealth. In the fifth sentence he represents farmers who acquire wealth in the country as moving to cities, and engaging in these city employments to increase that wealth! If these employments are not known to be profitable, would whole masses of men, year after year, quit other profitable pursuits to engage in them? Either, then, your statement, Mr. F., in regard to city employments is not true, or your multitude of thriving farmers, who carry into the cities this wealth made elsewhere are fools. But the fact is, that BOTH THESE STATEMENTS ARE UNTRUE, for the wealth of cities is the result of city employments, and men who have grown rich by farming are not the persons who are found occupying the counting-houses of cities. Who ever before heard of the commercial ranks of our cities being annually supplied with recruits who had spent the better part of life following the plough? Mr. F. "dreams dreams, and sees visions." Again, Mr. F., in his second sentence acknowledges that men "become rich in the country" in free States—yet in the same sentence he says that they "cannot carry on agricultural operations EXTENSIVELY in the country in free States." That is, LIMITED AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS WILL ENRICH them in a free State. One might suppose that if they grew rich by limited operations they might be satisfied to continue those operations. But, in the next sentence, he tells us that extensive operations are impracticable because of "the high price of labor in the free States and its irregularity." If the labor is too high to make money in an EXTENSIVE operation, it would certainly be too high to enable a man to "become rich" in a LIMITED OPERATION. If the price of labor is such that a man can grow rich by hiring enough of it to buy a small farm, a proportionally larger force hired, at the same rate to work a larger farm, would surely ENRICH HIM MUCH FASTER. Again, on turning to page 34, we find him contradicting flatly what he here states as to the high price of agricultural labor in free States. In that part of his lecture it suited him to represent the laboring class in the free States as paupers and their 'wages

as reduced to the cost of subsistence." "And hence," says he, "the whole class must be subjected to the melancholy and terrible necessity of working, rather to avoid the poor-houses, than of bettering their condition." This handful of contradictions is just a specimen lump; such as could be picked up and analysed on almost every page of this remarkable document. We could not do justice to a tythe of them without writing a respectable sized volume.

As an illustration and proof of his discovery that city wealth is not made in the city but imported from the country, he states some FACTS, as he terms them, exhibitiv of the vast immigration into Boston of persons born elsewhere, and the vast decrease of her native population, and then observes: "These facts afford striking evidence not only of the sources of Boston wealth, but of the rapidity with which it is wasted on its arrival." Unfortunate Massachusetts! to be cursed with such a city as Boston! Dull unobservant New Englanders! You have neither discovered the FACT of your impoverishment nor the CAUSE of it. You have prided yourselves on your growing cities, and vainly imagined that they enriched you. You have not been aware that your most renowned city has only supported its existence by preying on the vitals of the Commonwealth. You will hereafter know that Boston is a vampire that sits on the feeble and decrepit body of the old Bay State, sucking out its life-blood, while she sleeps on unconscious of her approaching dissolution.

The rapid waste of wealth in Boston, which fills the compassionate soul of Mr. F. with horror, may be judged from the fact that her assessments show an increase of personal property alone in seven years, previous to 1847, of upwards of \$30,000,000. Her whole assessed property amounts to \$162,000,000. That of all North Carolina is estimated by the Raleigh Register as certainly not exceeding \$140,000,000. Mr. F. gives us some statistics in regard to the population of Boston, the object of which is to prove "that there has been no material increase of the population of Boston in twenty years." This is another precious sample of Mr. F.'s reliableness in the handling of statistics, he seems always to make or misuse them. A good witness will not only tell THE TRUTH, but the whole truth. Why did Mr. F. undertake to show so intimate an acquaintance with facts in regard to Boston population, as to lead people to think his conclusions might be relied on, if he was ignorant of that fact, all-important as to the point he had in hand, that a LARGE MASS OF THE POPULATION WHICH PROPERLY BELONGS TO BOSTON NOW LIVE WITHOUT THE LIMITS OF THE CITY. In the same way Mr. F. could prove that there is a decrease of the population in the city of London since the time of King Charles I, though the people who belong to London have increased by many hundreds of thousands.

The population of London now covers miles and miles around "the city," which has been to a great degree surrendered to purposes of business and habitations for those whose avocations do not permit them to leave their places of em-

ployment. Did Mr. F. know the situation of Boston and the density of its buildings twenty years ago? If so, he would not have wondered that it could have no natural increase with its proper limits. But the country for miles around is covered with villages occupied by those whose employments are in the city, and to whom their recent facilities of conveyance bring their places of business as near as they would be if distant a few minutes' walk. Between 60,000 and 100,000, of those who are in one sense as much the inhabitants of New York as those who reside in her upper wards, live across the East river in Brooklyn. The population in the lower wards of the city has DIMINISHED, by the multiplication of business houses, while miles of buildings have been erected outside of what was the city of New York 20 years ago.

Mr. Fisher must, we would suppose, be convinced in time that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." If he had known nothing about Boston, or if he had not imagined he knew more than he did, he would never have committed so gross a blunder as to represent her having no natural increase when her population has overflowed the limits of the city by tens of thousands.

JUSTICE.

REVIEW NO. 4.—CONCLUDED.

A formal array of facts and principles, brought forward to overthrow Mr. F.'s doctrine that TOWNS AND CITIES ARE DESTRUCTIVE OF A COUNTRY'S WEALTH, would, as we conceive, be not merely superfluous but ridiculous—we would as soon think of bringing up a park of artillery to attack a will-of-the-wisp. This notion is the offspring of Mr. F.'s brain, and his brain will probably be its sole abode. The immense gains derived from commerce and manufactures, of which cities are the abodes, are not the only contribution which they make to the wealth of the region in which they are located. By the steady and extensive demand which they create for every species of agricultural product, they stimulate to the highest degree the industry of the country and enhance the price of its lands, until they often multiply its resources to twenty-fold their former amount.

But Mr. F. is filled with horror and indignation at cities as the destroyers of life as well as property. He seems to regard them as so many vast malstroms that ingurgitate the riches and lives of all that come within their terrific suck. To substantiate this sweeping charge against all cities, in all ages and at all times, he cites the mortality of New York in 1847. Beautiful specimen of inductive logic! We were reminded by it of the philosophic generalization of the English tourist, mentioned in *Salmagundi*, who, meeting in Elizabethtown with a very fat landlord, entered the record in his note-book, containing the materials for a projected volume of travels, in the following fashion: "Memorandum—ALL JERSEY INN-KEEPERS FAT!" By this sort of process we can prove that the COUNTRY is most fatal to life. All that is needed for the proof is to select some district in which either from permanent local causes or from the visitation of a transient epidemic, there had been a remarkable mortality for one or two years, and then present this as a sample of the amount of disease and death in all country places.

"The healthy occupations of the country," says the writer of *Popular Statistics* (See Chambers, p. 295), "make a difference in its favor in the general mortality; but this appears larger than it really is, in consequence of the flocking of the worn-out and miserable to large towns, and the resort of sick persons thither for the sake of medical attendance, in the course of which life is in many cases cut short." Our space does not allow us to enter on as accurate and full an exhibition of the facts in regard to the health of cities as our materials would authorize. It is sufficient for our purpose to state that the elaborate returns of the British registrations are sufficient fully to refute all Mr. F.'s assertions. The health of particular cities varies with the peculiar locations and with

the temporary causes of disease to which they are exposed—just as country situations vary in different years from different causes. In Liverpool, for example, in 1849 the mortality from the same causes which operated in New York in 1847, was 1 to every 22 of the population, while in London, an immensely larger and more commercial city, it was only 1 to every 42, and in all England 1 to every 44. The health of the dense and crowded metropolis was but little below the average health of the whole kingdom. The difference between the health of London and the country is, as seen by the returns for a series of years, comparatively trifling, and very little more than might be expected from the causes mentioned by the writer quoted above; and this result of the observations of years is sufficient itself to show clearly that cities are not NECESSARILY the devouring whirlpools that Mr. F. represents them as being. Liverpool and Glasgow are, like New York, exposed to the contagious diseases introduced of late years by the multitudes of poor, starving, Irish emigrants who flock to them, and thus increase the apparent average mortality, not only by adding so many deaths of non-residents to swell the number to be divided among the resident population, but also by spreading disease and death among the residents in those quarters of those cities where they temporarily locate. The statistics of McCollough and Chambers contain a large amount of information on this subject, to which we can only refer.

To give an idea of the ordinary mortality of New York, Mr. F. takes a year when the immigration was greatest, and every ship-load for Ireland imported a mass of contagious disease. Now look at the difference in the late mortality in Glasgow produced by the increase of this same sort of immigration. In 1821 the mortality was 1 to 39, in 1831 it was 1 to 31, and in 1838 it was 1 to 26. It was even greater than this a few years later, during the years of Ireland's greatest sufferings, as we learned from a statement to which we cannot now refer.

As proof of the destruction of life in New York, he cites, further, the fact that there is a much less proportion of children than there ought to be. He might as well cite the over proportion of children in a small town where a college and schools are located. In the latter place the pursuits are such as to gather a disproportionate number of children—and in a city, a multitude of men of all descriptions gather from all quarters in search of their respective objects.

Mr. F. quotes from the American Almanac to prove the superior average duration of life enjoyed by agriculturists over persons engaged in city employments, and argues that their longevity is enough to account for their being richer. It did not suit Mr. F. to tell his readers that this same table from which he quoted showed that PAUPERS AS A CLASS WERE STILL LONGER-LIVED THAN AGRICULTURISTS. If the longevity of farmers accounts for their supposed superior wealth, it ought to prove the paupers to be rich.

Another of the popular delusions which Mr. F. feels it to be necessary to his purpose to dispel, is "the common opinion that much greater inequality of property exists in the South than in the North." (p. 15.) "Though," says he, "I profess no exact knowledge on this point, there is enough known to prove that this cannot be the case." What, then, is the evidence by which Mr. F. expects to induce mankind to renounce a conviction which is the result of general observation? Let us see.

The first proof of the great equality in the distribution of property in Virginia is, that two-thirds of her males over 21 years of age are either lease holders, house-keepers, or own a freehold worth twenty-five dollars. Now, granting all that Mr. F. claims here, he proves that ONE THIRD of the males in Virginia over 21 are so poor as to be incapable of qualifying themselves to exercise the right of citizenship as voters, by either keeping house or purchasing even a share in real property to the value of \$25! This is truly a glorious distribution of property, in a Commonwealth from which a large portion of the laboring and poorer classes have been driven out to make room for 450,000 slaves, held chiefly on large farms. But even this is a better case than Mr. F. could make out, had he not called in the aid of an ABSURD CONJECTURE and a FALSE ASSUMPTION. He conjectures that in Virginia, limited as is their right of franchise, and consequently highly as it is prized, about EVERY TENTH VOTER STAYD AWAY FROM THE POLLS DURING THE HOTLY CONTESTED PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1844; and he assumes that from 1840 to 1844 there was NO INCREASE

OF MALES over 21 years of age. Thus he proves that wealth is very equally distributed in Virginia—and who would be bold enough to assail such proof? Having proved the equality of distribution in Virginia, he turns to the North to prove its "inequality" there—and his conclusion in this case is drawn from premises still more singular. These premises consist of the following facts: 1st. In one of the interior counties of New York only half the voters were freeholders, as Mr. F. ascertained by a statement which he once saw. 2d. The cities of New York and Boston contain nearly half the property of the States to which they respectively belong. 3d. In these cities pauperism prevails to a greater extent than anywhere else in the Union. Now the deduction from these three facts of the conclusion, which Mr. F. draws, that "it is very clear that great inequality of property prevails," is a feat of logical legerdemain which almost rivals the performance of the juggler who will break three eggs in an empty hat and draw out a plateful of hot rolls. We do not like to spoil so beautiful a specimen of logical art—we will therefore refrain from handling as rudely as we might a portion of the facts contained in these premises, and will leave this conclusion to rest undisturbed in its glory.

The next proof of the greater inequality of property in the north which he adduces, is the fact that there are more pleasure carriages in Virginia than in Ohio in proportion to the respective numbers of their free population. In Virginia there are 19,000 such carriages and in Ohio 50,000. This fact proves something, but not what Mr. F. designed. The State of Ohio is comparatively in its infancy—scarcely half a century has passed since it was a vast wilderness, trodden only by the wild beast and the savage, and its emigrants, like all settlers in new countries, carried but little capital with them. It is, then, truly astonishing that, in its brief period of its existence, they have cleared off their heavy forests, improved their farms, converted their Indian paths into broad and [in many cases] paved highways, and accumulated so rapidly the comforts and even luxuries of life, as to have two and a half times as many pleasure vehicles rolling along their roads as are to be found in Virginia—a State nearly two-thirds larger than Ohio, and nearly 200 years older. This is truly one of the prodigies of free labor. This comparative result is also the more wonderful when we reflect upon the fact that one-fourth of the population of Ohio are inhabitants of towns, and have, consequently, little occasion for the use of such vehicles, while their use is almost indispensable to the comfort of a rural population, like that of Virginia, among whom, therefore we would naturally expect to find them in greater numbers, if they could afford to procure them.

The absurdity of Mr. F.'s vehicular argument to prove the equal distribution of property is seen very strikingly in comparing the number in Ohio with the number in Kentucky. Ohio has 50,000—Kentucky [which he says nothing about in his argument] has 6,302. The white population of Ohio, according to the census, was not three times that of Kentucky, while the number of pleasure carriages is NEARLY EIGHT TIMES AS GREAT! Yet, Mr. F. says that, for "the equitable allotment of its wealth, Kentucky may challenge any community." Either this assertion or his carriage argument must be good for nothing.

The greater inequality in the distribution of property in the free States is further proved by

Mr. F., by the fact that Virginia and Kentucky built more houses in 1840 than Massachusetts and Ohio. We confess our total inability to see how the fact that one community builds more houses in a year than another proves anything in regard to the comparative distribution of property. It might, at first view, seem to prove one or other of two things—either that the community which is building most rapidly is *increasing faster in population*, or that it is *increasing faster in wealth* and vesting its accumulations in houses of a better description than those occupied before. It is certain, however, that the greater number of buildings does not prove the superior increase of population in Virginia and Kentucky, for the census show *not inferentially*, but *directly*, that the *reverse of this is true*. Nor can it prove their superior increase in wealth and comfort unless it is seen that the larger number of houses involved in the erection of a larger investment of capital. Unfortunately for Mr. F. *his own statistics prove the reverse*, and show that the investment of capital and comfort was larger in the new buildings of the free than in those of the slave States. The amount accumulated in Massachusetts and invested in houses was *about double* of that similarly invested in Virginia. In the former \$2,767,134—in the latter only \$1,367,393. The average cost of each of the houses built in Massachusetts was \$1,752, the average in Virginia \$454. This is a striking fact, exhibitiv of the rapid and superior increase of wealth and the physical comfort which is its natural result, in the free State, as compared with its increase in its slave competitor. This fact becomes even a more striking proof of the superior accommodations with which the inhabitants of the free State are providing themselves, when we remember that buildings of the same extent of accommodation, the same quality of materials, and the same excellency of workmanship are erected at less expense in Massachusetts than in Virginia. Building, it is well known, is much more costly in Virginia and Kentucky than in Massachusetts and Ohio. Looking at the average cost of the Virginia houses, as indicated by Mr. F.'s own statistics, we are compelled to conclude that a very large portion of them must be \$50, \$100, and \$200 edifices. The number of such buildings erected in a State increasing so slowly in population is easily accounted for—they are needed to replace similar unsubstantial and comfortless buildings that had preceded them and had gone to decay. We feel certain that a large portion of these architectural specimens of the equal diffusion of Virginia wealth were designed for negro quarters. The number of such buildings, in any point of view in which you can regard it, is truly a curious proof of the equitable allotment of property among the whites.

Mr. F. fills several pages (17 and 18) with a statistical argument designed to show that the people of New York, Massachusetts, and Ohio are not as well fed as those of Virginia. Granting all Mr. F.'s *facts*, the evidence would only amount to this—that Virginia with a much larger proportion of her laborers engaged in agriculture raised a quantity of agricultural products

whole population than was raised by New York, Ohio, or Massachusetts. His inference from this evidence is, that *the Virginians eat much more than the inhabitants of those States*—that is, he infers the nature and amount of what has been eaten in a community by learning the nature amount of what has been raised in it. This and inference is of the same character with that drawn by the sagacious student of the healing art, who, having learned from his preceptor that he had detected the imprudence of a patient who had been indulging in oysters by observing the empty shells under the bed, hastened to put in practice, on a subsequent visit, the instruction he had received, and discovered, to his dismay, by the evidence of a saddle and bridle under the bed, that the refractory patient had actually eaten a horse. The inference from the amount and character of their products to the quantity and quality of a people's food would show that a commercial people starve and that Southern planters fatten mainly on cotton seed. Without knowing what is the amount and character of the food exported or imported, parading the respective products raised in two different sections as evidence of what and how much the inhabitants respectively eat is worse than nonsensical—it is deceptive. Mr. F. gives us no hint as to the amount of her wheat and other best agricultural products which Virginia has to part with to procure the varied manufactures of the North, which she is obliged to purchase. He proves that the Virginians use more wheat bread than the people of New York, Ohio, or Massachusetts. We simply state this as furnishing a fair specimen of Mr. F.'s power of proving anything, to all persons who have ever mingled with Virginians and Northerners and know their respective culinary tastes.

In comparing even the respective quantities of food of the two sections, Mr. F. adheres to his favorite notion that the blacks are not to be regarded as concerned in the quota of food that belongs to the slave State—he carries through the comparison for a whole page on this assumption, showing that the Virginians are better off in respect to food, because, if all the food raised in Virginia were divided among her white population, each would have a better share than would fall to the lot of each Northman, if the agricultural products of his State were equally divided out among its inhabitants. After carrying on the comparison in this style, he admits, in the way of a concession which he seems evidently to regard himself as not bound to make, that the blacks may be in some degree considered in the distribution of food. "The excess of animal food," says he, "in Virginia and Kentucky, over New York and Ohio, is quite large—quite large, indeed, *even if we include the slave as well as the free population*."

It would perhaps be tedious, and is certainly unnecessary, to examine the facts of this provision argument in detail, and thus show how partial and defective they are, and how entirely they fail in warranting his conclusion. One of them we will take as a specimen of the philosophical ability which he displays in tracing facts to their causes, and drawing for them

He compares the agricultural products of Massachusetts in 1840 and in 1845, and finds a decrease in the bushels of wheat, of 162,000; of corn, 218,000; barley, 34,039; rye, 116,000; buckwheat, 70,000; and potatoes, 83,000. The cause which he assigns for this decrease is the rapid decline of agriculture in Massachusetts, and particularly a tendency to prefer the cultivation of the cheaper and less nourishing sorts of food for the finer kind of breadstuffs. And his inference from the fact is that "the farmers of Massachusetts consume but little wheat, and use rye, Indian corn, and potatoes as substitutes." To an observer of facts who was seeking for truth, and not straining his vision to hunt for materials to build up a fanciful theory, it might have occurred that it would be well to observe whether the deficiency of products in 1845 was not the result of accidental causes. He would then have looked to the results of subsequent years to see whether this decrease was regular and progressive—for, if it had been occasioned by the causes he assigns for it, it would have become greater in successive years. Now, if he had looked at the statement of the products for 1847, as estimated at the patent office from a mass of information gained from the most reliable sources (see Patent Office Report, p. 84-8,) he would have seen that instead of the rapid decrease which he speaks of there was a great increase, not only above the products of 1845, but even above that of 1840. The increase, as compared with the amount in 1845, was, in wheat, 208,000 bushels; in corn, 1,425,000; in rye, 178,000; in buckwheat, 103,000; in potatoes, decreasing 459,000. We hope that Mr. F.'s wrath which breaks forth so cuttingly on the commissioner of patents for adopting a foolish measure of the wealth of States, will not prevent his availing himself of the estimates of Mr. Burke.—when made from reliable data. He might forgive Mr. Burke for the blunder of inventing a measure of wealth that proves Indiana to be richer than Massachusetts, because it has more people, when he reflects that he himself blundered rather worse when he invented a rule which would make Russia in her past barbarism richer than the United States, England or Holland.

Again, a philosopher, who, like Mr. Fisher, conceives that his "investigation of causes will naturally elucidate the character of modern civilization," ought not to have assigned, as the cause for a decrease of wheat, the desire on the part of farmers to substitute for it corn, rye and potatoes, as their articles of diet, when the same tabular statement, from which he drew his knowledge of the fact that the product of wheat had diminished, showed him, with equal clearness, not only that there had been *no compensating increase of the rye, corn, or potatoes*, but that there had been an *actual decrease in the amount of each of these imaginary substitutes*.

Further in that wide and comprehensive survey of all the possible causes of remarkable phenomena, necessary to so valuable and important a work as that of "elucidating the character of modern civilization," it might have occurred to a philosophical inquirer like Mr. F. to examine whether the farmers of Massachusetts might not,

to large cities, find it more profitable to raise potatoes, buckwheat, and rye than to raise the finer breadstuffs. Their large cities furnish a ready and constant market for all these products, which are consumed, as all men know, by the inhabitants of the cities, *not as necessary substitutes for better food*, but as *ARTICLES OF LUXURY*. Those markets, too, supplied with wheat by the rich soiled States better adapted for its cultivation, would enable them to procure to advantage the finer breadstuffs raised elsewhere, in exchange for coarser and bulkier products which their own hard soil would yield in greater abundance and to better profit. The inference, too, that a cautious investigator, philanthropically desirous of deducing conclusions designed to "materially elucidate modern civilization," would have drawn from his table of facts, would have been not that "the farmers of Massachusetts CONSUME LITTLE WHEAT BREAD, and use rye, Indian corn, and potatoes as SUBSTITUTES," but that the farmers of Massachusetts were rapidly CURTAILING THEIR RATIONS OF WHEAT BREAD and were at THE SAME TIME DIMINISHING THEIR FORMER ALLOWANCE OF RYE, CORN, AND POTATOES! If the decrease of the wheat crop warrants the inference that the farmers eat less of wheat bread than formerly, then the decrease of rye, corn and potatoes proves with equal clearness that their WHOLE ALLOWANCE IS CURTAILED. So that the result of this "elucidation of modern civilization" by Mr. F. is the disclosure of the fact, that the farmers of Massachusetts are fast advancing to a state of starvation! What an odd set of curmudgeons these Massachusetts farmers must be, for all the facts of the census show us clearly that their average product per acre and per man is much higher than is received from Virginia land and labor, yet they seem to grant themselves the right of eating as grudgingly as Mr. F. grants it to a Virginia negro.

Among other strange facts, for the knowledge of which the world is indebted to Mr. F., are three that he gives us on page 16, in connection with this dog and hominy argument. The first is that New York is greatly deficient in her wheat crop. By the returns of the census we find she raised an average of more than five bushels for every human being in the State. Let any one calculate the amount of consumption of a family which uses wheat-bread exclusively (as scarcely any family ever does,) and he may then see how dreadful is this deficiency, which gives a larger average than the individuals of perhaps any family consume. 2d. He tells us that New York does "not supply her deficiency by importation." Mankind have imagined that the flour of Ohio and Virginia was carried in vast quantities to New York. Mr. F. tells us that this is all a dream. He is so bent on making the New Yorkers live on potatoes that he will not allow of any importation. 3d. He tells us a fact which as he says very truly, "is remarkable that Virginia, with nearly half a million of slaves, instead of resorting to this cheap food (potatoes) for them produces only about three millions of potatoes, and provides her negroes with corn of which her annual crop is 34½ millions, and is a much more costly and substantial article of food."

Mr. F.'s testimony, Virginia masters are more liberal to their slaves than he is inclined to be—they give the slaves, he tells us, plenty of the costly and substantial products, while he is inclined to allow them none. They do not deal with the slaves in PRACTICE as Mr. F. does in ARGUMENT. But would it not indeed be a remarkable fact that New York farmers should consider potatoes to be good enough for themselves and families to eat, while Virginia masters scorn to raise them for their slaves. There is one trifling circumstance which has escaped the eye of this statistical philosopher, which, if he would condescend to learn, would render the conduct of Virginians less remarkable in feeding the slaves on corn instead of potatoes—it is that in Virginia a bushel of POTATOES IS DEARER THAN A BUSHEL OF CORN—the climate and soil and habits of cultivation make CORN THE LESS COSTLY CROP OF THE TWO.

Where the system of slavery has had time to work out its appropriate results, it is notorious that its strong and decided tendency to impoverish the land and depopulate the country is clearly marked. Take lower Virginia as an example, where the system has been long in operation, and where the bulk of her slaves are held. The white population is diminishing in number, and the lands are diminishing in productiveness. Thousands upon thousands of acres have been turned out as no longer repaying the labor of cultivation. This process is continually going on and threatening to reduce extensive districts of a once productive country to the condition of a vast and desolate wilderness. The foot of the slave has impressed sterility on the soil wherever it has long trodden. The statesmen and patriots of this ancient Commonwealth have, for years past, observed with feelings of regret this destructive process, and lamented in eloquent strains the decay of their beloved land. But to the vision of Mr. F. there is nothing appalling in all this. The sight of a vast tract of country reduced to barrenness, and deserted as unfit any longer for cultivation, presents to him, as he tells us, "an evidence of thrift rather than poverty in the emigrant," who has fled with his slaves from the sterility he has created! We can well understand how there may be great "thrift" in a MAN'S RUNNING AWAY from his land after it has become too much impoverished to yield him a subsistence, but we cannot understand the nature of that "THRIFT" WHICH REDUCES THE LAND TO THIS CONDITION. What must be thought of a system of labor that continually needs for its support a fresh supply of new and rich lands to be in their turn exhausted of their fertility? If this institution of slavery shall be permitted to continue among us, until it shall have reached an extreme boundary, and run its complete natural career, its results may then be summed up on the page of the historian, in language borrowed from Holy Writ, descriptive originally of the passage of a herd of locusts over one of the rich provinces of the Eastern world—"before it the land was as the garden of Eden, behind it a waste, howling wilderness."

Mr. F. "admits and rejoices in the fact that Southern modes of living are incompatible with a dense population." He regards as a great evil the growth of towns and cities, and the division of land into small farms—and, to preserve ourselves from these evils, he thinks that we ought to retain the institution of slavery, which will drive off our white population as fast as it grows up.—We think that it scarcely requires an argument to satisfy any Kentuckian or Virginian that his State would be in a better condition if it had at least four times its present amount of white population. Four millions of inhabitants in Kentucky would furnish us with a population about six times as large as our present white population and would then only give us to the square mile a number equal to that of Massachusetts, and not more than a third of the number belonging to many of the most prosperous European States. But already in the richer counties of our own State the whites are beginning to diminish steadily. Between 1830 and 1840 there was in ten of our central and most fertile counties a decrease of the white population of 16,402, and an increase of the blacks to the amount of 2,156.

The wisdom of keeping our negroes to expel our children may appear very manifest to a philosopher, like Mr. F., engaged in "elucidating the character of modern civilization," but to the admirer of the white race or to the father of a family it may not be so apparent. If this institution shall remain in Kentucky for half a century longer, there will be then no market in the newer States to take off our surplus slaves; they will multiply according to the well-known laws of population, and be shut up

igrate more rapidly, thrust forth by the increasing hordes of blacks, until at length the population of our now beautiful State will resemble that of feudal Europe in the middle ages—composed of a small class of scattered barons, living isolated on their extensive domains, and surrounded with hosts of unproductive serfs. John Randolph, of whose prophetic powers as a statesman Mr. F. seems to entertain a high opinion, once expressed the belief that the time would come when advertisements for runaway slaves would cease, and advertisements for runaway masters would take their place in our papers—thus expressing his belief that the time would come when this institution, the object of Mr. F.'s admiration as the great "element in modern civilization," would become so profitless and oppressive that masters would shrink from their responsibilities, and rather turn loose their slaves than sustain the burden of their support. And it is to fill our State ultimately with such a population that Mr. F. desires freemen to be compelled to emigrate.—Few, we imagine, will unite with him in his preference—the views of most reflecting men, might, with the change of a couple of words, be expressed in the language of one of England's popular poets:

It fares the land to hastening ills a prey.

Where SLAVES accumulate and men decay;

Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,

A breath can make them as a breath has made;

But a bold yeomanry, their country's pride,

When once destroyed can never be supplied.

A variety of statistics are produced by Mr. F. to prove that the population increases more rapidly in the South than in the North. So large a portion of these statistics are made up of mere conjectures—conjectures, too, without any reasonable ground, and so many data necessary to a correct conclusion on this point are omitted—that they furnish a mere shadow of reasoning without its substance. But, if they proved all that Mr. F. asserts, they would prove NOTHING THAT IS OF ANY VALUE IN THIS CONTROVERSY. We all agree, as one of the evils of the slave system, the fact that it depopulates a State, that under its influence the population increases for a season, then becomes stationary, and ultimately declines, leaving the State with a population too sparse to be able to develop the resources of the country, or to advance the community to its highest degree of wealth, intelligence, and religion. The population of the South does not, as the Northern population, increase in the OLD STATES.—It increases in the SOUTH AS A WHOLE SECTION ONLY BECAUSE IT CAN YET FIND NEW AND RICH LANDS TO OVERRUN AND DESOLATE. But this process must soon cease, for soon no rich lands will remain to receive the successive flights of emigrants expelled by the slave system from the older settlements. Slave States yet in their infancy are already beginning to exhibit the premature symptoms of decrepitude and decay produced by this destructive system. Intelligent and patriotic men of the South look with dismay to that future which their observation of the course of events forces upon their vision. The prospect of the multiplied evils which threaten to fall with crushing weight upon all the present Southern States, as soon as this emigration is checked and the growing population of the South is retained within its present limits—the prospect of these evils is the cause of the determined resistance by the South to all efforts for the territorial restriction of slavery. As long as the system possesses the power of expansion over a wider range of yet unexhausted territories, these evils are but partially felt. They will develop themselves with increasing and fearful energy as the power of expansion is diminished; and, as soon as this power is fully gone, the curse of slavery begins to be fully felt.—While Mr. F. is painting the beauties of slavery, and while he is eulogizing its glorious productive power and manifold happy influences, Southern statesmen are devising plans to check its increase among them and to roll away, at least for a season, the threatening evils with which they see that it is sure ultimately to overwhelm them. That these evils are not the phantoms of a diseased imagination—that they are not the feverish dreams of a sickly philanthropy—any man may satisfy himself if he will observe how State after State in the further South is endeavoring to fence itself against the introduction of more slaves within its borders. The recent letter of Judge Heydenfeldt to the Governor of Alabama is but a fair exponent of the views and feelings which pervade the mass of thinking and intelligent men in the South.—"If," says he, "there be anything which can unite the South in a firm and determined attitude to resist any de-

is the fact that she is already over supplied with a laboring population not sufficiently productive to remunerate her, and about the future fate of which she is compelled to entertain just and reasonable apprehensions.”

“Again,” says he, “I insist that the UNPRODUCTIVENESS OF SLAVE LABOR and its GRADUAL BUT CERTAIN IMPOVERISHMENT OF ANY STATE, are sufficient reasons for limiting its further propagation among us.” “The State of Alabama is now poorer than she was fifteen years ago—notwithstanding that in that time there have been expended within her limits nearly ten millions of foreign capital, and for which a heavy State debt is now hanging over her people; at the same time that her resources for taxation are every day diminishing, and while a question of fearful domestic import is agitated for her destruction, her political strength is yielding to the rottenness of a system which must finally reduce it to a cypher.” “We have in our midst the germ of an anti-slavery party—not in the Northern sense of the term—not men who sympathize with the slaves and would therefore turn them loose upon society—but composed of those who are wearied with the struggle of unproductive labor; those who deem of slavery that it has produced pecuniarily nought but barrenness and politically nought but bitterness; those who desire more populous white communities for the purposes of trade and education, and those who regard the slaves as the rival in production.” We might quote column upon column of such statements from the thinking men of the South who have been reared upon her soil and observed for years, with an eye of patriotic solicitude the operation of that system which Mr. F. glorifies as the great element of modern civilization.

Mr. F. occupies several pages in statistical reasonings to show the awful amount of pauperism and crime in the free States. In a portion of these reasonings his facts are false, and in another portion his conclusions are illegitimate. We had purposed, had space permitted, to have given a detailed exhibit of the gross blunders and hideous exaggerations contained in Mr. F.’s representation of the condition of the North in regard to the amount of these social evils under which he declares it to be fast sinking. But we are saved from any necessity of doing this, as we perceive that it has been done in a satisfactory and able style by Mr. Mussey in a review of Mr. F.’s lecture, just issued from the press in Cincinnati. To this review we would refer any reader who may wish to see a complete exposure of Mr. F.’s statistics and arguments on the pauperism and crime of the North, as well as on various other points, which our limits have obliged us altogether to omit, or on which we have been compelled to touch but lightly. Mr. Mussey uses strong language, but not stronger than the case justified, when, at the close of his searching examination of Mr. F.’s statistics of pauperism in the North, he remarks: “Such misstatements, wherever and however they originated, are disgraceful in a work purporting to give authentic statistics, or even pretending to general accuracy.”

We will only add, in regard to the pauperism and crime of the South, one or two general observations, which are necessary to a fair comparison of the two regions in these respects.

Each slaveholder exercises in his own household and on his own farm, a jurisdiction nearly as absolute and extensive as that exercised in the middle ages of Europe by a feudal baron on his own domains and over his own vassals. He is in all matters that do not affect life itself the supreme legislator and judge over his own slaves. Now what would be thought of the fairness of a comparison between the records of the court of the high judiciary of England in the days of William the Conqueror or Henry Beauclerk and the records of the king’s courts now in England, with a view of ascertaining the comparative amount of crime at these different periods. The mass of crimes were then punished in the baron’s courts—now they are all punished in the king’s courts.—SO THE MASS OF CRIMES IN A SLAVE STATE ARE PUNISHED IN THE MASTERS’ COURTS—in a free State they are punished in the courts of the Commonwealth.

To compare then the number of trials or convictions in the Commonwealth’s courts of these respective States, with the view of ascertaining the comparative amount of crime in each, is either folly or fraud. To any one who knows the moral character of the great body of slaves, it must sound supremely ridiculous to hear a man gravely talk of the less amount of crimes committed by them than by an equal number of free laborers. Further, as the master is clothed with power to administer justice in the case of all crimes the penalty of which falls

short of death, so he is charged with the responsibility of supporting all paupers who have been his own slaves. And enough of this pauperism many a master finds upon his hands—almost every farm has its paupers of one description or other upon it, and they often prove a heavy burden on its resources. But Mr. F. will perhaps acknowledge what every observer knows to be true, that slavery produces more crime and pauperism in proportion to the whole population of a State than are to be found where all are free—yet he may put in the plea that he is concerned only in comparing the pauperism and crime of the whites of those respective regions. But, as far as crime and pauperism are expensive, the loss falls on the property holders of the community, no matter whether the criminals and paupers are slaves or freemen—and, as far as morality is interested, that system is certainly to be condemned which most increases these evils, no matter what may be the color or condition of the human beings among whom it extends them. It is certain that there are fewer paupers and criminals among the free inhabitants of the slave State in proportion to their numbers—but why is it so? Slavery degrades labor, and thus drives off in multitudes the free laborers. When this class of whites, among whom the pauperism and crime of a free community are chiefly found, has been expelled, and its place filled with slaves among whom these evils exist to a far greater extent. Mr. F. congratulates the country, which has made this calamitous exchange, on the fact that there are in it comparatively fewer criminals and paupers among the whites. CRIME IS DIMINISHED BY THE EXPULSION OF THOSE WHO COULD COMMIT IT. “Order reigns in Warsaw,” was the famous proclamation of the Russian despot, when he had exterminated, or driven from their country the unhappy Poles. Order will reign when there are none left to disturb it—there will be no outbreaks or crimes where desolation and death hold undisputed sway.

We had intended giving a brief summary, at the close of our review, of the various errors of Mr. F. which we have not had space even to notice, such as his romance about the number and condition of the females of Massachusetts who are employed in “the factories,” his incorrect representation of the agricultural condition of France, connected with his erroneous views of the superior productiveness of extensive farms, his misstatement of the results of West India emancipation, his unfounded assumption of the incapability of the black race for the enjoyment of freedom and self-government, and his representations of the comparative education and religion of the two sections. But we fear that we have trespassed already beyond our due limits—and to state all the mischievous errors of this lecture would be like pointing out all the sores on the body of a Lazarus.

We take our leave of Mr. F. with the hope that when he next writes he will employ his pen in favor of some cause, the advocacy of which will not so effectually paralyze his intellect as a logician and his humanity as a Quaker. Mr. F. may disclaim, as we see he does in his letter to the New York Tribune, the design of commending and promoting slavery, but all who print and circulate his lecture expend their time and money in doing so, because THEY REGARD IT AS A DEFENCE OF SLAVERY, and all who read it FEEL THAT IT IS SO—to such, too, as have not the information and skill to detect the incorrectness of its facts and the sophistry of its reasonings it is a most conclusive defence. That Mr. F. did not mean it to be such we are glad to learn, while we cannot but regard him as engaged in work similar to that of “the mad man who scatters firebrands, arrows, and death, and exclaims, ‘am I not in sport?’” The peculiar circumstances under which his lecture was issued gave a peculiar venom to the poison which its errors contained. The constitution of Kentucky was about to undergo revision, and many of us who are slaveholders hoped to have the opportunity of persuading our fellow-citizens of what we felt to be true, that SLAVERY IS A CURSE—we hoped that, when public attention was directed to the subject, the mass of our people would feel disposed to adopt prospective measures for EMANCIPATING OUR COUNTRY, OURSELVES, AND OUR SLAVES from the bondage which this system imposes on us all. Under such circumstances, we would rather have forfeited forever the power of sending winged words to the understandings and hearts of our fellow-men, than to have done what Mr. F. has done to strengthen the prejudices of education and habit, to excite more strongly that feeling of avarice which prompts to wrong, and to furnish the defenders of a system based on a denial of the rights of man, with poisoned weapons to fight against humanity